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Abstract

The City of Bradenton is a patchwork city, whose neighborhoods vary greatly in quality. While its neighborhoods differ in type based on consumer preference, they vary in quality because of federal, state, and local planning and urban policy. These policies have resulted in inequality of place and race, clustering racial minorities in center city neighborhoods with deteriorated infrastructure and income inequality. This impacts the ability of the City to be competitive with other cities as a metropolitan whole. The City’s economically and racially segregated neighborhoods are not the inevitable outcome of market forces, but rather reflect decades of federal, state, and local policy decisions. This study will provide new scholarship in the body of knowledge about inner city decline in small Sunbelt cities.
Introduction

Inner city decline is often seen by governments and their citizens as a problem that originates in a distressed community and largely impacts the residents of that neighborhood. However, while poor planning and development policy harms residents of inner city neighborhoods, it has a negative spillover effect on residents of the entire metropolitan region. For residents of metropolitan areas impacted by inner city decline, patchwork development creates divided municipalities where place matters very much in terms of quality of life for the residents of the community as a whole. Research by Dreier, Mollenkopf, and Swanstrom (2004) showed that patchwork development is not financially advantageous to any citizen of a metropolitan region.

Planning policy can facilitate economic, social, and political stability, or it can contribute to instability and decay. This thesis will look at the ways that planning policies have created a "patchwork" community in Manatee County with unequal distribution of amenities and infrastructure, rather than a "seamless" city where all residents live in neighborhoods that provide opportunities for equitable life outcomes.

Guided by the work of Dreier, et al 2004; Myers (1999); Sen (1999); Sjoquist, Ed. (2000); Thomas (1997); and Bobo, Oliver, Johnson, and Valenzuela (2000), this study will use a socio-political approach to planning, to examine the political, economic, social, racial, and educational factors that resulted in planning policies that make place very interconnected to quality of life.
The seamless city concept was developed and articulated by Rick Baker, who served as Mayor of St. Petersburg, Florida from 2001 to 2010. A key element of his strategic plan, it was crucial that “every aspect of the city must be part of the effort and part of its success” (Baker, 2011, p.18). Further describing the idea, he said:

“In a seamless city, when you go from one part of town to another, you never cross a seam—whether a street, interstate overpass, or railroad track—and enter a place where you do not want to be…where you feel the need to reach over and lock your car door; an area with boarded up buildings, broken windows, and large tracts of urban blight, with drug dealers on every street corner. All parts of the city are not the same, and that will always be true. Some areas have large houses and big lots, while others may have duplexes and apartments; but all parts of a seamless city should have certain things in common. They should be safe and clean and should have the services, retail, and public infrastructure that adequately accommodate the people who live there. A seamless city is an attitude that we are all in it together. It means that we do not pit one area against the other, but work toward advancing the entire city by addressing the needs of the parts…” (Baker, 2011).

A patchwork city would be the opposite of this seamless city defined by Mayor Baker. In a patchwork city, there will be neighborhoods where residents do not want to go because of crime, decay, blight, and inadequate infrastructure and economic development. This topic is important for planners and residents of communities with fragmented and patchwork development. If a city and its planners do not understand the role of broken, inefficient, inadequate or dated structures in the current condition of its blighted neighborhoods, planners will not be able to guide community residents and government officials to a consensus about the most appropriate approach to revitalization.

There are a number of large city studies about urban decline in municipalities like Chicago, Detroit, Atlanta, and Los Angeles, but small city studies about urban decay are less readily available. This study will examine the process of urban decline in the central
east Bradenton neighborhoods of Manatee County, Florida. The particular focus is the Central Community Redevelopment Agency (CCRA) redevelopment district in the incorporated area of the City of Bradenton. The hypothesis of this study is that economically and racially segregated neighborhoods are not the inevitable outcome of market forces, but rather reflect decades of state, local and national policy decisions. The City of Bradenton will be used as a case study with which to explore these decisions. As Sunbelt cities generally, and smaller cities in particular are seldom studied in the literature, a case study of Bradenton will add valuable insight into the scholarship of urban growth and decline.

Planning and zoning policy resulted in the platting of neighborhoods and the development of significant standards for waste treatment, water, electric, and building codes early in Bradenton’s history. African American residents, however, were limited to substandard housing units, and even today live in a neighborhood that stands out because of deteriorated physical infrastructure and negative socioeconomic indicators, compared to other neighborhoods in the City of Bradenton. The intersection of race and planning has contributed to the racialization of the community’s spatial organization, particularly when exacerbated by federal and state policies. The impact of these policies is evident in the racial, spatial, and demographic arrangement of the neighborhoods, and will be discussed in detail below.

This study will focus on federal, state, and local policy implemented between 1900 and 1985. This timeframe was chosen because policy, race, and planning crucial to the neighborhood infrastructure and the development of the patchwork city were implemented in these years. While the study area is neighborhoods within the City of
Bradenton Central Community Redevelopment Area redevelopment district, this study will not focus on policies implemented by the redevelopment agency. These neighborhoods were designated as a redevelopment area because their similar history connects them in shared present day issues. The primary research questions will address the following:

1) How have federal, state, and local planning policy impacted the spatial and racial demographics of the study area?

2) How have political and racial factors impacted the implementation of federal, state, and local planning policy in the study area?

Literature (Dreier, et al, 2004; Thomas, 1997; Sjoquist, 2000; and Bobo, et al, 2000) indicates that these factors are important to consider in the study of inner city decline. While many policies have impacted cites, Dreier, et al (2004) discussed urban policy as deliberate or stealth in its design. Deliberate policies such as inconsistent and exclusionary land use and zoning policies are implemented by communities who attempt to increase their competitiveness and become more attractive to potential residents by excluding racial or economic groups. This creates communities of varying quality through inconsistency of policy. Alternatively, stealth policies such as transportation, military spending, and homeownership have benefitted suburbs at the demise of the center city even though it was designed to meet a general need. Overt and covert urban policy creates patchwork communities because the positive and negative impacts of planning policy are inequitably distributed. Preliminary research shows that this theory is relevant to a study of central Bradenton because multiple layers of planning policy have impacted neighborhood design and spatial patterns, and multiple factors have impacted each layer of decision-making.
Research shows that these subjects are relevant to the study of center city decline, including preliminary research on the Central CRA neighborhoods. Systematic analysis modeled on previous studies will provide a coherent framework for analysis, and describe to readers the processes functioning in these particular city Sunbelt neighborhoods.
Chapter 1: Literature

Because the Central CRA is a high poverty neighborhood, it is important to develop an understanding of poverty theory and inner city decline through review of literature on similar communities. Existing literature on the topic will create a framework for the study. Planning theory has a history of developing precedents for what good cities should consist of. Much of this theory has its roots in the overcrowded and unhealthy cities of the rapidly urbanizing cities of the industrial era. Fishman (1977) described the design work of Ebenezer Howard, Frank Lloyd Wright, and LeCorbusier as concrete attempts to create “utopias” that would reverse the social inequality of cities (p. x). The Garden City concept was created in 1898 by Ebenezer Howard. In these collectively owned, self-sustaining, 6,000 acre communities of 30,000 residents, flanked by greenbelts of farmland and parks, a perfect geometric design would allow for equitable and cohesive distribution of amenities. Frank Lloyd Wright outlined his vision for idyllic city living in 1935 through the Broadacre City. This vision of community decentralized the archaic modern city by a return to collectivized, bucolic smaller villages centered on home life, which would be supported by the community and cultural amenities. LeCorbusier believed that great cities required more than decorative projects to remake the urban fabric—they required a rethinking of the urban system. “City of Tomorrow,” published in 1929, and “The Radiant City,” published in 1935, outlined his philosophies for implementing the new framework for cities. Unlike Wright, he believed that the
densification of cities in skyscrapers surrounded by parklands would provide city-
dwellers the harmony they needed in their lives. These skyscrapers would provide the
ideal fusion of social and productive activities. While these three early theorists proposed
different solutions to urban decay, they each recognized a relationship between the social
and physical dynamics of cities. They sought to create a healthy urban condition through
physical schemes that provided urban dwellers social and physical solutions.

Inspired by the Ebenezer Howard’s Garden City concept, in 1929 Clarence Perry
proposed a comprehensive, neighborhood-based solution for the social problems of the
city on a scale much smaller than the solution envisioned by Howard. Rather than
orienting neighborhoods around existing traffic grids which disrupted the social fabric of
communities, they should be built to accommodate the needs of families who live in
neighborhoods. Current neighborhoods were deficient because families were best able to
carry on community life when they had amenities in close proximity. Perry’s proposed
solution to restore the neighborhood’s capacity to healthy function was the neighborhood
unit. The six neighborhood unit design principles were 1) size, 2) boundaries, 3) open
spaces, 4) institution sites, 5) local shops, and 6) internal street systems. Perry’s
paradigm would foster moral and social values, and provide civic benefit to citizens
(Perry, 1929). Perry believed an ideal neighborhood should be located on 160 acres of
open space, and consist of population enough for one elementary school. Each
neighborhood unit should be centered around a community center; have suitable
distribution of open space, homes, and shopping zones; and have a church (Dahir, 1947).
With the social, relational, and service deficits that exist in inner city neighborhoods
today, Perry’s philosophy of a healthy neighborhood is a worthwhile precedent to revisit.
Poverty

Poverty is central to the problem of inner city decline because most center cities with declining infrastructure also experience poverty—particularly African American poverty. Some theorists believe that poverty and city decline is directly connected to the sociology of those living in the cities (Moynihan, 1965). Others believe that it is a symptom of multiple structural factors (Sen, 1999; Chambers, 1983; Friedman, 1987; Christian, 1994; Jayakaran, 1996; and Myers, 1999). Research on inner city decline indicates that a more comprehensive framework to understanding poverty provides a more thorough understanding of cities and their residents.

In 1965 Assistant Secretary of Labor Daniel Patrick Moynihan brought the discussion of urban poverty and neighborhood decline to the national stage with the release of “The Negro Family: The Case For National Action.” He described the causes of African American poverty (which persisted in the aftermath of the 1954 Civil Rights Act) as twofold: ongoing racial prejudice, and centuries of racism which have resulted in negative economic, educational, and social indicators, the primary problem being the structure of the Black family. This deficit in family structure prevented Black inner city residents from overcoming the economic, educational, and social inequities they experienced. In a time when racial prejudice was prominent and the problems that Moynihan described were very real, many latched onto the decline of the African American family as the cause of inner city poverty, rather than the structural causes he described.
Similarly, Harrington (1964) attributed chronic and persistent poverty to a sense of despair that arose from being a member of the invisible underclass that missed out on the economic gains of the 1930s. The classic poor became established in geographically isolated neighborhoods as their individual depression became collectivized at their lack of access to opportunities, and the lack of opportunity was compounded with the passing of time. While this describes one component of the problem of poverty, it places significant weight on the role of individuals rather than the role of restoring access to the economic, educational, political, social, and workforce problems that created the depressed communities.

West (2001) wrote on the role of race in America, and said that race does matter very much for the life outcomes of Black Americans. Whereas liberals prefer the implementation of economic programs as a solution to racial problems, conservatives focus on moral behavior of poor Black Americans. West argues that both of these are simplistic solutions to the problem of poverty because they ignore the structural inequality created by racial injustice. West described his view thus:

“Hence, for liberals, black people are to be ‘included’ and ‘integrated’ into ‘our’ society and culture, while for conservatives they are to be ‘well behaved’ and ‘worthy of acceptance’ by ‘our’ way of life. Both fail to see the presence and predicaments of black people are neither additions to nor deflections from American life, but rather constitutive elements of that life. To engage in a serious discussion of race in America, we must begin not with the problems of black people, but with the flaws of American society—flaws rooted in historic inequalities and longstanding cultural stereotypes” (p. 6).

For West (2001), discussing the nihilism seen in some members of the Black urban poor was not problematic. West did not attribute the cause of nihilism to personal shortcomings of Black Americans as some behaviorists might. Rather, he attributed it to
repeated experiences with failure to achieve upward mobility. This theory by West (2001) is useful for looking at the study area, because it provides a nuanced framework for evaluating race and poverty, as opposed to Harrington (1964), which places too great a weight on the relationship between poverty and personal responsibility.

A broad base of literature emerged that focused on the structural nature of poverty. Sen (1999) identified the comprehensive nature of poverty when he described development as the restoration of freedom. He highlighted five primary areas where freedom is typically restricted: political freedoms, economic facilities, social opportunities, transparency guarantees, and protective security are five important freedoms for at the center of development. The converse of freedom for Sen is unfreedom. Unfreedom is seen in poverty and tyranny; poor economic opportunities and social deprivation; neglect of public facilities; and intolerant, overactive, or repressive states. Similarly, urban communities can be seen as developed when a comprehensive network of economic and political freedoms has been restored. Because the poverty rates of the City of Bradenton are significantly higher than those of County residents, comprehensive explanations such as those postulated by Sen (1999) are appropriate to consider.

Myers (1999) also described high poverty communities as complex. He adapted existing poverty theories from other development theorists, to improve on deficiencies in other models. Chambers (1983) stated that the poor live in clusters of disadvantage that become a poverty trap. Similarly, planning academic John Friedman (1997) stated that poverty is a problem of powerlessness centered on a lack of access to social power in the domains of state, political community, civil society, and corporate economy.
Development practitioner, Jayakumar Christian (1994) framed poverty in the context of a disempowering system—the poor are subject to cultural, social, personal, spiritual, and biophysical systems that interact together and prevent them from overcoming poverty. Myers also reviewed the work of Participatory Learning and Action practitioner Ravi Jayakaran (1996). Jayakaran’s framework for understanding poverty is similar to Sen (1999)—mental, spiritual, physical, and social barriers prevent the poor from escaping poverty.

While Myers agreed with the work of these practitioners, he focused on the relational element of poverty’s systemic causes that was absent in these models. “Poverty is a result of relationships that do not work, that are not just, that are not for life, that are not harmonious or enjoyable” (Myers, 1999, p. 86). He identified four relationships in a community’s social / political / economic system: the relationship between an individual and the community, the relationship between an individual and the environment, the relationship between an individual and God or gods, and the relationship between an individual and others. Like Moynihan (1965), Myers notes the relevance of social factors in poverty. Myers, however identified it as only one of its contributing factors, rather than a primary factor. People of all economic groups have personal and family deficits and family decline, but the compounding factors of these other relationships maximize the negative effects of deficits in personal and family systems. “The poor are no more lazy, fatalistic, improvident, stupid, or arrogant than anyone else. All people suffer from these problems, poor and non-poor alike. But only the non-poor can afford to indulge in these behaviors” (Myers, 1999, p. 64). This is an important theoretical foundation for understanding the development of neighborhoods in
central east Bradenton. Research on the neighborhoods shows that there were strong institutions and businesses, but there were a number of factors that resulted in the lack of competitiveness of the neighborhood. The poverty of these neighborhoods and the resulting decay is comprehensive, and the stakeholders that impacted the policies and decisions that shaped the community were a function of relationships that resulted in a reduced quality of life for the residents of the CCRA.

**Urban Decline**

On a macro level, decline in U.S. urban city centers accelerated in the years after World War II. The particulars of each city’s story vary, but the story of urban decline has several common themes. Post-war federal housing policy and low interest mortgage lending in new, racially homogenous suburbs; interstate highway funding; zoning policy; and the post-war baby boom are the common denominators that led to the flight to the suburbs by White families and businesses (Hall, 2002). The mortgage lending process codified by the Home Owners Loan Corporation and the Federal Housing Administration created space-based and race-based center city decline. Any neighborhood with a C or D ranking would not receive a loan, and a majority Black neighborhood would automatically receive a D ranking, and thus could not receive any loan. If a neighborhood became racially mixed, it was considered unstable and ineligible for financing (Thomas, 1997). Black homebuyers were restricted to center cities during the suburban building boom, and White homebuyers had residential mobility. The Interstate Highway and Defense Act of 1956 increased highway expenditures from $79 million in 1946 to $2.9 billion by 1960 (Dreier, et al, 2004 p. 116). This allocation of federal funds through the Highway Trust Fund allowed interstate highways to pull critical mass away
from center cities—something that had previously not been feasible for local and state
governments. Manatee County has experienced similar centripetal forces in the creation
of its suburbs and in the decline of its inner city, with the federal highway subsidies in the
construction of I-75, suburbanization in the 1990s, and racial residential patterns.
Therefore, these sources are relevant to guide the pursuit of additional local sources in
this study.

of inequality. Their study of inner city decline and the corresponding rise of the suburbs
chronicled the political choices that make the life outcomes of inner city residents much
different than the life outcomes of suburban residents. In 1960, center city income in an
85 city sample exceeded the suburban income by 5 percent. By 2000, however, center
city incomes were lagging behind their suburban counterparts earning just 83 percent as
much (p. 45). The authors state that “Federal and state policies have favored suburban
sprawl, concentrated urban poverty, and economic segregation” (p. 3) and “the poor have
become concentrated in central cities and distressed inner suburbs, while the rich live
mostly in exclusive central-city neighborhoods and outer suburbs” (p. 3). In American
inner city neighborhoods with concentrated poverty, there is a spatial mismatch between
jobs and housing, higher incidence of negative health indicators directly tied to
environmental factors, poor housing quality and recreational facilities, reduced access to
consumer goods, and reduced access to quality financial services. This approach to
academic research has not been taken in the City of Bradenton and the Central CRA, and
will be used in this study.
Race & Federal Housing Policy

The racial, spatial divide is a significant component of inner city decline in most cities, and the same is true of Bradenton. Research shows that nationally and locally African Americans accept racially mixed neighborhoods, whereas Whites are much less accepting of integration. While the Civil Rights Act of 1964 set a legal precedent by prohibiting racial discrimination in federally funded programs, employment, voting, public and private facilities, and education, it did not prohibit racial criteria from being used in the development of public housing. Title VIII of the 1968 Civil Rights Act specifically prohibited the federal government from racial discrimination in HUD programs, but according to Vernarelli (1986) much ambiguity remained in how the clause “affirmatively promoting fair housing” (p. 214) should be interpreted. Hills v. Gautreaux (1976) and Shannon et al. v. US Department of Housing and Urban Development (1970), and the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 set judicial and legislative precedents in favor of racial integration of federal housing programs. Hill v. Gautreaux set a precedent that HUD had both the right and the responsibility to correct neighborhood racial imbalances created by policies. Shannon v. HUD ruled that HUD did not have procedures to review the impact of an urban renewal project on neighborhood racial concentration and was in violation of the Fair Housing Act. In 1972, HUD developed project selection criteria—criteria that had previously not existed. The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 articulated the new standards explicitly, stating “The site shall not be located in an area of minority concentration” (Vernarelli, 1986, p. 220). Three public housing projects are located in the study area. This literature is significant because much of the housing policy and racial housing
patterns in Bradenton were decided before judicial precedent was set in favor of racial integration. Research into the interplay of federal and local policy in Bradenton will be important for understanding the local context.

Goldstein and Yancey (1986) studied the racial segregation of White and Black residents in Philadelphia, looking at the spillover of race, poverty and the culture of poverty in public housing (i.e., White flight); site selection policies; and the “historical ecology” (p. 263) of neighborhoods (or natural social and economic patterns) as possible explanations for public housing segregation. While the study found that the neighborhood ecology was the primary factor in its current racial makeup, and had no significant impact on racial change, the study did find that public housing was more likely to be located in areas with low real estate values and center city decline, which had higher concentrations of Black residents. Gray and Tursky (1986) studied the racial and ethnic occupancy patterns for HUD-subsidized housing in ten metropolitan areas. The study found that the minority-headed families receiving Section 8 HUD vouchers were more concentrated in minority census tracts, and housing built through the Section 236 program that subsidized the project mortgages were more likely to be built in minority neighborhoods. Public housing built before 1968 was the most likely of all HUD projects to be located in a minority census tract, and represented the majority of all housing types in the study. These studies are relevant because the precedent in housing policy nationally indicates that race and politics may have been important factors involved in the location decisions for the Sugg, Page, and Rogers Garden public housing projects in Bradenton.
Race, Planning, and Zoning

In addition to intimidation and covert urban policies that constrained the residential mobility of African Americans and shaped the urban form, racialized planning and zoning policies also were often implemented by municipalities. Thomas and Ritzdorf, Ed. (1997) described both the origins and strategies used by governments. In the South, after exclusionary zoning was declared unconstitutional in Buchanan v. Warley in 1917, land use regulations, comprehensive planning, and expulsive zoning were used to segregate neighborhoods. The first comprehensive racial zoning ordinance was enacted in Baltimore in 1910. It went beyond the scope of the California Chinese laundry ordinances, and stated that Black residents “should be quarantined in isolated slums” (Thomas and Ritzdorf, Ed., 1997, p. 27). The reasons for the ordinance were “to reduce the incidents of civil disturbance, to prevent the spread of communicable disease into the nearby White neighborhoods, and to protect property values among the White majority” (Thomas and Ritzdorf, Ed., 1997, p. 27). Because of legal challenges to racial zoning in the 1930s and 1940s, cities began to use neighborhood planning, road building, siting of public housing, slum clearance, and private deed restrictions rather than racial zoning. When these practices codified racial prejudice, the racial spatial form of neighborhoods was solidified.

Markets & Neighborhood Development

There is also discussion about the role of markets and personal preference as opposed to policy in the decline of center cities (Jackson, 1985; Thomas, 1997; Sjoquist, 2000; Bobo, et al 2000; Hayden, 2003; Cashin, 2004; and Dreier, 2004). Research shows that preference in housing choice plays a role in neighborhood choice, but planning
policy has steered preference away from cities so that the choices consumers make are not neutral. As Jackson (1985) noted, for the first time, suburbs (buoyed by federal transportation and housing subsidies) provided a commodity that was previously unavailable to consumers: affordable housing for purchase in privatized spaces. For Hayden (2003), suburbs provided a fulfillment of the American Dream: “It is a landscape of imagination where Americans situate ambitions for upward mobility and economic security, ideals about freedom and private property, and longings for social harmony and spiritual uplift” (p. 3). For Dreier, et al (2004), the structures and systems created by covert urban policy were more powerful than spot investments by overt urban policy, which was rendered ineffective. The study noted:

“The free-market view of urban decline and suburban sprawl is wrong. Federal policies toward metropolitan areas did not waste billions of dollars on urban programs that tried but failed to reshape cities against powerful market forces. On the contrary, federal urban policies were an outstanding ‘success’ from a free market perspective: they promoted powerful economic trends that resulted in greater economic segregation and more urban sprawl, albeit with extremely high social costs. The political, economic, and social landscape that we take for granted is a product of federal and state policies that shaped individual and corporate decision making” (p. 150).

Policy promoted suburbanization where consumers were provided affordable, spacious housing as an alternative to cramped city apartments that could not fulfill the American Dream. The suburbs of today often provide a better alternative to cities when cities fail to invest in infrastructure and economic development, particularly when these decisions are layered over time. These studies are significant because they indicate that the beginnings of patchwork cities lie in policy decisions that supported the development of quality neighborhoods for certain groups, rather than simply personal preference for suburban or urban neighborhood form.
While the policies associated with center city decline and the rise of the suburbs are important, it is important to note that suburban neighborhood form was not in itself to blame for the decline of the city. Brower (1996) discusses qualities of good neighborhoods, and classifies them into four basic types: they can be center neighborhoods, small town neighborhoods, residential partnership neighborhoods, and retreat neighborhoods. The center neighborhood characteristics are those of an urban center city, and the residential partnership neighborhood characteristics would correspond to those of a traditional suburban development. Brower (1996) concludes that each of these neighborhood types demonstrate good characteristics, provided good design principles are used in their execution. Urban decline occurred in American center cities, however, because of racial and social inequity in the execution of social, political, and housing policy.

Some have also said that segregation is a preference of Black residents. Research shows that this is not the case. Studies of housing preferences in Atlanta, GA indicate that Black residents are much more willing to live in integrated neighborhoods than White residents. Yet, Atlanta, has a Black-White dissimilarity index of 78 in the city and 52.4 in the suburbs (Sjoquist, 2000). In Los Angeles, CA, the Black-White dissimilarity index is 73 and studies of housing preferences again show that Whites are always the most preferred neighbors and Blacks the least preferred by all groups studied (Bobo, et al 2000). Detroit residents expressed negative attitudes towards living in racially mixed neighborhoods. In 1976 and 1992 residents were asked if they would feel comfortable living in neighborhoods with 20 percent and 50 percent Black populations, and perceptions improved between the survey periods, but residents still expressed discomfort
at living in racially mixed neighborhoods, and said they would either not move into the neighborhood, or would try to move out (Thomas, 1997, pg. 207). Cashin (2004) discussed how Whites are willing to pay more to obtain racial homogeneity in neighborhood composition. Racial segregation may be a preference of some consumers, but it is not the preference of most African Americans. The racial, spatial layout of center city neighborhoods are exacerbated by federal, state, and local policy decisions that restricted the mobility of Black residents to under-resourced center city neighborhoods and allowed White residents residential mobility in resource-rich neighborhoods throughout municipalities.

The race and class based inequality of ghetto neighborhoods has its roots in policies implemented after 1900 and reinforced in the subsequent years. Massey and Denton (1993) described these early processes. Prior to 1900, neighborhoods did not experience the extreme segregation demonstrated in indices of unevenness, isolation, clustering, centralization, and concentration. Industrialization was an initial driving force in the creation of segregated neighborhoods, and it was reinforced by hostility to integration, anti-integration ordinances, civic associations, and restrictive covenants. Federal homeownership policies continued to support these trends. Race, class, and place became closely interconnected because White families had both economic and residential mobility, whereas Black families did not. Politics and race were also closely related because the political interests of residents in the segregated Black neighborhoods did not have commonalities with the residents of segregated White neighborhoods, and it was difficult to build coalitions. Despite perceptions that northern cities such as Detroit, Chicago, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis are bastions of segregation with large African
American ghettos, major southern cities score worse on indices of racial segregation and isolation. In 1940, 1950, 1960, and 1970, 12 southern cities had a higher average index of nonwhite-white segregation at the block level than 18 northern cities (Massey and Denton, 1993, p. 47). In 1970, the index of Black isolation within neighborhoods was higher, on average, for 12 southern cities than 18 northern cities (Massey and Denton, p. 48). Bradenton’s center city racial, spatial patterns developed very early in the city’s history, and were reinforced through continuing social and political factors. Research indicates that there is no single trigger for the African American demographic shift to the study area neighborhoods. This requires additional study because the complexity of the neighborhoods’ history was previously not studied and the analysis in this study is much more cursory than is possible. However, the genesis of the neighborhood racial composition was as early as the late 1800s, and the demographics demonstrate the same type of unevenness, isolation, clustering, centralization, and concentration described by Massey and Denton (1993).

City Case Studies

Thomas (1997), Sjoquist (2000), Bobo, Oliver, Johnson, and Valenzuela, Jr. (2000), and Sjoquist (2000) provide a precedent for single city studies that investigate comprehensive structural causes for inner city decline. Thomas (1997) studied the interplay of redevelopment and race in postwar Detroit planning policy. The political, social, economic, and infrastructural impact of the planning decisions on Detroit’s center city and suburban ring are used as a framework for discussion. Conflicting local, state, and federal planning policies; layered with the suburbanizing factors seen on a national scale; inefficient city governance; and repressive racial policies contributed to the decline
of the city. Thomas’s approach to city decline, redevelopment, and race are applicable to
the study of Bradenton’s neighborhood development because preliminary research
indicates that social, economic, and (multiple levels of) political decisions impacted the
development of the CCRA neighborhoods.

Segrue (1998) studied inner city decline in Detroit from an historical policy
perspective in post-war years. The racial, spatial distribution of segregation and decline
is a result of employment policy, federal housing and highway policy, local planning
policy, and racial discrimination. He made it clear that urban decline was not a result of
just racial prejudice, but a combination of factors:

“Racially segregated neighborhoods are not alone the foreordained consequence
of centuries of American racial prejudice; rather, they are the result of the actions
of the federal and local governments, real estate agents, individual home buyer
and sellers, and community organizations. Economic and social structures act as
parameters that limit the range of individual and collective decisions. The
consequences of hundreds of individual acts or of collective activity, however
gradually strengthen, redefine, or weaken economic and social structures”
(Segrue, 1998, p. 11).

In Detroit, this resulted in higher African American joblessness, declining infrastructure
in Black neighborhoods, and elevated negative social and economic indicators. This is
relevant for Bradenton because African American residents have also experienced
reduced employment opportunities, declining infrastructure, and elevated negative
indicators, although not on the scale of Detroit. Rather than adopting Moynihan’s
framework for understanding Bradenton’s neighborhood decline, this is more
appropriate.

Connerly (2005) studied the impact of city planning and policy structures on the
racial, spatial layout in Birmingham, AL. Identifying Birmingham as the most
segregated city in America, he noted:
“At its roots, city planning is about controlling the land—most directly about what uses land is put to and were. From its earliest days, city planning and its primary regulatory tool, zoning, have been used not only to determine land use but also to protect property values and keep out or restrict groups of people whose presence was not desired by those in power. The latter purposes also lie at the heart of the white establishment’s efforts to erect and maintain racial segregation in Birmingham” (p. 2).

Birmingham had a strong tradition of planning and zoning. Despite the presence of parallel Black and White planning institutions, however, the Black planning institutions were not able to overcome White bias against equitable distribution of amenities because they arose as a response to inequity rather than as an equal force. The undesirable locations selected for Black housing, the city’s racial zoning code, and federal housing and highway policy created significant residential segregation and inequity. In Birmingham, railroads and the coal related industries brought Black labor to the city, in the same way that agriculture-related industry and railroads seem to have converged in Bradenton. Black residents in early Birmingham urbanization converged around the railroads. Their neighborhoods were highly segregated from the White neighborhoods, and had significant poor quality housing stock with open slats on the walls. In 1960, the Birmingham segregation index was 92.8 percent (Connerly, 2005, p. 20). As a Sunbelt City with significant segregation and inner city decline, the study methodology and description of the situation are applicable in Bradenton because it is also a Southern Sunbelt city.

Sjoquist (2000) studied inequality in Atlanta. Despite the perception of Atlanta as a Black Mecca, Atlanta is a community divided geographically along racial lines because of deliberate decisions made by government to segregate residents in patterns that exist today. The impacts on housing, jobs, and earnings have been negative for African
American residents. Bobo, et al (2000) had similar findings in Los Angeles. This study found a relationship between the spatial mismatch between jobs and housing, racial prejudice, and inequality. Both the methodological approach and the findings of these studies are significant because of the comprehensive approach this study is pursuing in Bradenton.

**Summary**

Because overt and covert urban policy has supported center city decline, cities must be aware of its multiple causes. A city can have an economically thriving downtown or center business district, but have an impoverished ghetto on the next block if a city does not approach revitalization and inner city decline with a comprehensive approach to economic development. Cummings (2002) suggested that a market-based approach to community revitalization has failed to develop the economic infrastructure and resources of low-income urban communities. This approach endorses a grassroots, multi-racial coalition advocacy approach that connects the poor to business and job opportunities in local markets. Rather than relying on market forces to bring the benefits to low income markets the coalitions will insure that the resources are brought to these communities for the benefit of the residents. Similarly, Porter (1997) suggested that in order to achieve sustainable inner city economic development, practitioners should not simply focus on programs that provide transfer payments, but rather on a market based strategy to promote income and wealth creation through business promotion and human capital development. These authors underscore the importance of social, political, economic, and economic networks and opportunities for capacity-building in inner city communities who have experienced patchwork development.
St. Petersburg Mayor’s Rick Baker addressed the problem of economic inequity in his strategic plan for the city. Cities with decayed neighborhoods are often criticized for a failure to create policies that support vital infrastructure, amenities, and economic development services. Mayor Baker’s strategic plan had five focus areas designed to achieve a seamless St. Petersburg by providing the missing infrastructure, amenities, and resources that would strengthen each neighborhood. By 1) improving public safety, 2) promoting economic development (particularly in the Downtown and economically depressed area the city designated as Midtown), 3) supporting public schools, 4) building strong neighborhoods), and 5) improving government operations, the city used targeted programming to strengthen the weak areas of the city (Baker, 2011). Mayor Baker employed a partnership-based approach in his effort to create a seamless St. Petersburg, because he recognized the importance of a unified city in achieving that goal. “If a city’s goal is to become seamless, it needs the help of the business community, all levels of government, neighborhoods, faith groups, community groups, and schools working together” (Baker, 2011, p. 255).

A seamless city and the processes involved in its development are the antithesis of a patchwork city. Literature and research indicates that the City of Bradenton policy during the study period allowed the creation and perpetuation of a patchwork city. The rest of this paper will discuss the methodology and research which supports the conclusions about the City of Bradenton’s development as a patchwork city.
Chapter 2: Description of Study Area

Manatee County was settled in 1842 at what is now the intersection of 14th Street East and the Manatee River, and the town of Manatee was incorporated in the early 1880s. Bradenton was incorporated in 1903. Manatee and Bradenton were merged in 1943 (City of Bradenton, 2009). At the time of the merger, the city was still small, with a population of only 11,039 and just five square miles of area (St. Petersburg Times, 1943). Agricultural production was significant in the earliest days of the County history. Citrus and pineapple, radishes, onions, lettuce, cabbage, tomatoes, and potatoes were grown in Manatee County and transported to Tampa. 200,000 boxes of tomatoes and 150,000 boxes of citrus were shipped from the 25 square mile production area in the county. Young northern migrant labor was used in the production of these crops (Cook, 1898).

Located in Manatee County, Florida within the City of Bradenton, the Central Community Redevelopment Agency (CCRA) was created in 2000 for a period of 30 years by Resolution 00-39 and by City of Bradenton Ordinance 2628 in 2001 after findings of fact found existence of slum and blight in the designated area (City of Bradenton, 2000; City of Bradenton, 2001). As discussed above, the CCRA policies are not a focus of the study. However, the CCRA redevelopment area boundary is very helpful for describing the policies in some of Bradenton’s oldest and most deteriorated neighborhoods. Under the authority of Florida Statute 163, Part III, Florida law allows municipalities to create redevelopment districts to eliminate slum and blight. “Slum
areas” have “physical or economic conditions conducive to disease, infant mortality, juvenile delinquency, poverty, or crime because there is a predominance of buildings or improvements, whether residential or nonresidential, which are impaired by reason of dilapidation, deterioration, age, or obsolescence” (FS 163.340). Additional conditions can include inadequate sanitation or poor open spaces, higher population density than surrounding areas, or dangerous conditions. Conditions that the statute defines as “blighted areas” are a “predominance of defective or inadequate street layout, parking facilities, roadways, bridges, or public transportation facilities; and failure to increase property values over the previous five year period; poor lot layout; unsafe conditions; high commercial and residential vacancy rates; and site deterioration (FS 163.340).

Recognizing the comprehensive nature of community slum and blight, findings of these conditions authorizes community redevelopment areas to develop a master plan to implement projects and activities that will address any of these slum and blight conditions identified in the findings of fact (FS 163.340).

In this 4,506 person (Central Community Redevelopment Agency, 2001b, p. 33), 598 acre area (Central Community Redevelopment Agency, 2004, p. 8), the CCRA findings of fact identified are “substandard conditions; unsuitable lot layout; inadequate infrastructure; crime; deteriorated and sometimes hazardous street conditions; oppressive traffic flow; insufficient job opportunities and diverse ownership, making reassembly of substandard sized lots difficult or impossible without public incentive” (Central Community Redevelopment Agency, 2001a). Despite its designation as a distinct district, the CCRA redevelopment area consists of several well-defined neighborhoods with historic significance that were identified through stakeholder input. The Martin
Luther King Avenue Corridor, Singletary, Washington Park, and East Bradenton neighborhoods each have their own distinct identity and characteristics. Appendix A has a map of the CCRA redevelopment area. Appendix B and Appendix C have maps of the City of Bradenton and Manatee County, respectively.

The Singletary Neighborhood sits on the west end of the CCRA redevelopment area, and is bordered by 1st Street East, Martin Luther King Avenue West, 13th Avenue West, and 6th Street West (Appendix D). Its primary features are the historic 13th Avenue Community center building and the new Bradenton Village Development completed in 2002 to replace the substandard, dilapidated Rogers Garden and Rogers Addition public housing units. In 1999, the Bradenton Housing Authority received the first of three U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Hope VI grants to be used in this neighborhood. The award of Hope VI grants is significant, because Hope VI grants are only given to fund “severely distressed public housing units” (HUD, no date). The key elements of the HOPE VI strategy approach to public housing changes ”the physical shape of public housing,” “establish[es] positive incentives for resident self-sufficiency and comprehensive services that empower residents,” “lessen[s] concentrations of poverty by placing public housing in nonpoverty neighborhoods and promoting mixed-income communities,” and “forg[es] partnerships with other agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and private businesses to leverage support and resources” (HUD, no date). In order for the Bradenton Housing Authority to qualify for the receipt of HOPE VI funds, a high concentration of poverty and public housing, a lack of outside investment, and lack of private partnership were identified as contribution factors in the neighborhood poverty. This is corroborated by the documented lack of
vacant commercial property, inadequate sidewalks and bike paths, inadequate lighting, and high number of small churches with poorly maintained properties on small lots (Central Community Redevelopment Agency, 2004).

The Washington Park neighborhood is a thirty-six square block area in the center of the redevelopment district (see Appendix E). Bordered by 1st Street on the West, 9th Street East on the East, Martin Luther King Avenue East on the North, and 13th Avenue East on the South, the CCRA Master Plan identifies a number of assets and liabilities. The two largest private sector employers sit on the edge of the neighborhood—Tropicana and Beall’s, Inc—and the largest healthcare employer are all within walking distance. A credit union and alternative school sit on the border of the neighborhood as well. Tropicana holds significant vacant parcels in the neighborhood along the east and south perimeter. This neighborhood is also plagued with poor infrastructure, seen in poor right of ways, connectivity and lighting; deteriorated apartments and rental homes; decaying churches; and gang activity (Central Community Redevelopment Agency, 2004).

The East Bradenton neighborhood is the largest of the Central CRA neighborhoods (Appendix F). Bordered on the west by 13th Street East, the east by 27th Street East, the north by Manatee Avenue East, and south by 13th Avenue East, the neighborhood is primarily residential. This neighborhood has the best park space, with a pool that sits on a 7.5 acre site, and another 25 acre park on the eastern end of the neighborhood. While the park space, population density, and historic commercial corridors are assets, the inadequate lighting and street connectivity and aging public housing, apartment complexes, and single family homes serve as liabilities for the neighborhood (Central Community Redevelopment Agency, 2004).
The Martin Luther King Corridor runs through each of the three neighborhoods, but its history as a vibrant commercial corridor in the African American community prior to integration sets this street apart as having its own unique characteristics (Central Community Redevelopment Agency, 2004).

The study area neighborhoods are poised to become the model for sustainability. Employment opportunities ring the neighborhood, the neighborhood density establishes a framework for walkability, and the downtown government center houses the main administration buildings for the City of Bradenton and Manatee County Government. Just blocks away from the western boundaries of the neighborhood, these employers have 550 and 1,950 employees respectively, and both entities draw a large number of visitors to do business at those locations. The three largest non-governmental employers (Tropicana Products with 1,600 employees, Bealls, Inc. with 1,550 employees, and Manatee Memorial Hospital with 1,500 employees) are within walking distance for most residents of the study area neighborhoods. A number of chain retailers ring the neighborhood on the collector highways at its margins. Starbucks opened in March 2009 on the outskirts of the district, a CVS Pharmacy is located at the intersection of Manatee Avenue West and US 301 a half mile north of the district, a newly renovated Kentucky Fried Chicken restaurant is located a half mile north of the district, and two new chain gas stations. A new green-certified elementary school opened in August 2009 just west of the Singletary neighborhood on 13th Avenue W, and provides opportunities to launch traditional sustainability efforts.

However, this neighborhood is not sustainable, and it stands out as distinctly different from other neighborhoods in the City. The substandard housing conditions;
unsuitable lot layout; inadequate infrastructure; crime; deteriorated and sometimes hazardous street conditions; oppressive traffic flow; insufficient job opportunities (because of skill mismatch); and diverse [land] ownership, that makes reassembly of substandard sized lots difficult or impossible without public incentive, were all identified in the study area’s findings of fact. As the following sections describe, interviews with former government officials and citizens of the Central CRA neighborhoods, planning archives, and historic maps show the role and implications of federal, state, and local planning policy in shaping the physical, social, economic, and racial composition of the study area. The physical and demographic structure of these neighborhoods is a result of government resource allocation decisions; lack of planning, building, and zoning; and restrictive racial policies (Love, 2011, Personal Interview; West, 2011, Personal Interview; Dunwoody, 2011, Personal Interview; Price, 2012, Personal Interview).

Demographic information on the Central CRA, compared to Manatee County and the rest of the City of Bradenton, indicates that African Americans are more concentrated in these neighborhoods, and the residents of these neighborhoods experience more negative social and economic indicators than residents of other neighborhoods in the city and county. Racial minorities are clustered in the City, as are lower incomes. The 2010 population of Manatee County was 322,833 (Office of Economic and Demographic Research, 2011) and the population of the City of Bradenton was 49,546 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The 2000 County per capita income was higher than the national average of $21,587 at $22,388, but again, Bradenton falls below both at $20,133. Median family incomes of County and Bradenton residents lag well behind the national average of $50,046 at $46,576 and $42,366, respectively. In 2000, the County population was 86.33
percent White, 9.28 percent Hispanic, and 8.17 percent Black. Bradenton was 77.9 percent White, 11.25 percent is Hispanic, and 15.29 percent Black. 9.45 percent of Manatee County residents are below the poverty level, whereas 11.87 percent of Bradenton residents are below it (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). In 2010 the income and racial disparities were still present at the county level. 16.1 percent of Bradenton residents were in poverty (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010), compared to 14.5 percent of Manatee County residents and 16.5 percent of Florida residents (Office of Economic and Demographic Research, 2011). Bradenton is 73.3 percent White and 15.9 percent Black, whereas Manatee County is 81.9 percent White and 8.7 percent Black (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010).

The 4 Census tracts that most closely match the study area cover a much larger area (17,090 persons), but these demographic indicators show that poverty and race are clustered to an even greater degree in the study area neighborhoods than in the rest of the City. Minorities are more likely than Whites to live in the center city and study area neighborhoods. The poverty rates of these Census tracts are almost double those in the rest of the City. Of those in poverty, Black residents of these Census tracts are much more likely than Whites to be in poverty (U.S. Census, 2010). A detailed description of the demographics is in the charts below.

Table 1: % of Population in Poverty – Census Tracts 1.03, 7.03, 7.04 and 7.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Race By % - Census Tracts 1.03, 7.03, 7.04 and 7.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These demographics are important because they confirm the qualitative research that highlights the role of centripetal policy forces that drove Black residents to the center city neighborhoods. They are also important because they indicate that the negative policy impacts have had a spillover effect to neighborhoods outside of those which experienced the greatest degree of racial clustering in the earliest years of the neighborhood’s formation.

The White-Black dissimilarity index for the Sarasota-Bradenton MSA is 64.4 by Census Tract, but 79.6 at the Block level, indicating highly concentrated levels of racial clustering at the neighborhood level (Population Studies Center, 2000). The City of Bradenton White-Black dissimilarity index is 74.4 (Social Science Data Analysis Network, No Date). Research by Dreier, et al (2004) indicates that the condition of a faltering center city impacts inner city residents, but it also impacts the entire city—the entire metropolitan region underperforms when the center city falls. One study found that communities with high income disparities were more likely to have lower employment growth, and another study found a high correlation between suburban and inner city incomes (p. 43). It is much more beneficial to all citizens of a metropolitan area when a community experiences seamless development rather than patchwork
development. It is important for the City of Bradenton to note these demographics in their policy analysis.

Bradenton has significant retail disparity—a strong indicator of the existence of a patchwork city. HUD (1999) analyzed retail disparity in 48 cities. Retail disparity exists when the available retail capacity of an urban market is leaked outside of the area because of an absence of available retail opportunities. This report determined that significant out-shopping occurs in Bradenton. There is a $36.6 million, 16.5 percent gap in retail purchasing power of low income neighborhoods (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1999).

These demographic indicators show that the City trails the rest of the County in positive economic indicators. Minority residents are clustered in the City. According to literature, these demographic patterns are seen in other cities experiencing center city decline (Thomas, 1997; Sjoquist, 2000; and Bobo, Oliver, Johnson, Jr. and Valenzuela, Jr., 2000), and this makes the Central CRA neighborhoods ideal for a detailed study of small city neighborhood decline. It is crucial that a detailed study of this neighborhood identify and document its path to decline.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This is a small-city exploratory case study which will triangulate the information obtained using literature review, content analysis, and interviews. Overall, the methodology for this study is informed by literature on urban decline. Research on city decline shows that economic, political, social, racial, and historical factors have shaped historic planning decisions. Robson (2002) stressed the importance of designing any study around existing theory. Thus, planning policy in Manatee County, the City of Bradenton, and particularly the Central CRA will be explored using an historical, economic, political, social framework, which is guided by the approach used in literature on urban decline described above.

Exploratory research is used when little is known about a topic. More specifically, the purpose of exploratory research is to “1) satisfy the researcher’s curiosity and desire for better understanding, (2) to test the feasibility of undertaking a more extensive study, and (3) to develop the methods to be employed in any subsequent study” (Babbie, 2002, p. 88). Even though much is known about urban decline in general, little is known about urban decline in the City of Bradenton, particularly using this approach. Because this study is designed to understand reasons behind the urban decline, this study is also somewhat explanatory, as defined by Babbie (2002). Research that identifies explanations for events or occurrences given the data gathered can be described as explanatory. The mixed method employed in this research is useful because Babbie
(2002) cited failure to provide satisfactory answers as a significant problem with exploratory research studies.

Case studies allow for a detailed study of one community or event. Robson (2002) described a case study as “a strategy for doing research which involves an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real life context using multiple sources of evidence” (p. 178). Robson (2002) identifies community studies of “one or more local communities (p. 181)” as a properly scientific approach, provided proper processes and procedures are used in the enquiry. A case study plan that has all elements of sound enquiry will include a 1) background overview, 2) procedures for data collection 3) research questions, sources of data and their matrices, and 4) procedures for reporting. Bradenton is ideal for this approach because case studies inherently triangulate in their methodology.

Interviewing is a valuable way to learn about a topic where insufficient data exists. Because this is an under-researched topic, there was a need for primary research to corroborate the information from literature on urban decline and secondary sources. Many residents of the study area were negatively impacted by policy choices of government officials, and experienced the decision-making process from a perspective that the documented historical record does not fully reflect. Also, there are retired and current government officials who have institutional memory that guided inquiry in the City’s written record. The work of Robson (2002) provided guidance for interviewing design and implementation methodology. For flexible, qualitative design research, Robson (2002) suggests semi-structured interviews, where the questions are developed beforehand, but the interviewer has freedom to modify, clarify, add, or remove questions
based on their best judgment during the interview. Due to the exploratory nature of this project, semi-structured interviews were most appropriate. I interviewed the following sources:

- Former Member of Housing Authority Board
- Community Residents
- Former Planning Officials
- Current Government Officials
- Current County Official

These sources were selected because my familiarity with their knowledge of the history of the study area indicated that they would provide new information that was not available in the written record. The information they provided triangulated data available in planning meeting archives and newspaper archives.

Preliminary secondary research of newspaper archives and historical planning documents showed that race, politics, and planning played a significant role in the development patterns and ensuing decline of Bradenton’s center city neighborhoods. Newspaper archives indicated that Black residents experienced separate and unequal treatment in Bradenton. It was expected that archive searches of City meeting minutes, ordinances, and resolutions would provide the same degree of information. Land use and zoning maps were expected to show changes in the code standard for the City, to identify what key policies impacted neighborhood change. Historic maps were expected to provide indications of what land conditions may have contributed to the allocation of land for African American occupation. Therefore there was a need to study City, planning, and newspaper archives as the units of analysis. Babbie (2004) describes content analysis as “the study of recorded human communications” (p. 314). For Robson (2002), content analysis should be used as a “secondary or supplementary method in a
multimethod study” (p. 352). This is the view taken in this study. I used the following
documents to inform my understanding of the City’s development:

- Newspaper archives related to race, planning, and zoning (1941-1984)
- City of Bradenton resolutions and ordinances (1904 -1970)
- Sanborn fire insurance maps (1911-1929)
- City and County plat maps (1896-1954)
- Florida maps (1877-1913)
- City of Bradenton Council meeting minute archives (1937-1963)

The methodology from Robson (2002) was used to establish a framework for content
analysis. Because this is a secondary method, it is too broad to search every newspaper
printed or planning document prepared. Therefore, the study used keyword searches of
newspaper archives in the Google News Archive and the City of Bradenton electronic
records database to find relevant information on the relationship between planning,
zoning, and race. Interviews with community residents and government officials guided
searches in planning and City documents. Because content analysis played an important
role in the research, it is important to note that the recorded minutes, resolutions, and
ordinances in the City archives are not complete. For this reason, this study did not
employ content analysis in the purest form, tallying the number of each keyword in table
form. The following words are some of the primary words that were used extensively in
keyword searches of archives, both separately and in combination:

- Negro
- Colored
- Zoning
- Planning

The available record indicates that there is a lengthy history of planning, zoning, and
housing code, but the available documents reference other ordinances and resolutions that
are not on file. This poor documentation practice is important in itself because it provides further evidence of the improperly applied planning policies in the city.
Chapter 4: Racial Discrimination in Bradenton

Research indicates external pressures are largely responsible for the racial demographics and deteriorated physical infrastructure in the CCRA redevelopment area. The neighborhood racial, spatial, and physical makeup was not organic, but rather a function of external political and social forces impacting the African American community (Dunwoody, 2011, Personal Interview; Love, 2011, Personal Interview).

Manatee County was a slaveholding county, and Brothers John and Robert Gamble as well as the Braden family (the City of Bradenton namesake) came to grow sugar cane and produce molasses with their slaves during the 1840s because of the climatic advantages. Unlike some slaveholders who grew sugarcane for their own consumption, these were three slaveholders who brought large-scale sugar cane production to the area because they saw it as a significant income generating activity. Robert Gamble brought 100 slaves to his plantation on the Manatee River. The Gambles would sometimes pay slaves for tasks performed beyond the normal scope of work (Rivers, 2000). A City of Bradenton Historic Preservation Inventory and Analysis identified the Gamble’s plantation as the largest and best outfitted sugar plantation in the U.S. (City of Bradenton, 2009). This plantation changed ownership several times, but at its peak in production before the Civil War 200 slaves worked the sugar cane production (Thompson, 1865-1866).

The exact trigger for Black movement to the study area is not clear, and literature on Black Reconstruction-era urbanization patterns is limited. Several factors seem to
have contributed to the initial movement to the study area. Slavery seems to have had little to no impact on the Black population in the Reconstruction Era. All but 11 slaves were sold from the Gamble mansion and sent to Louisiana (Thompson, 1865-1866). Despite the transition from forced labor, according to Cook (1898) migrant labor worked in the high-production volume agriculture industry, particularly citrus. Harllee (1969) indicated that there was a significant presence of Black sharecropping north of Bradenton in Palmetto. There were a number of agriculture related businesses in and around the study area. Fruit packing and ice plants seem to have developed to handle the agriculture products shipped out on the railroads (Sanborn Map Company, 1915). The railroads cut through the City in a number of arteries (Gibson, 1985). As research below indicates, the residential options for Black residents were limited because of racial intimidation by White residents of the City and County. The racial, spatial patterns of these neighborhoods may have developed as worker housing for African American residents in these industries. Thus, it is likely that these factors attracted the first African American residents to their first settlement locations, but it is important that this be studied further.

Shofner (1977) discussed the enduring legacy of “The Black Code” carried over from the slave era and enacted in Florida after the Civil War. Despite warnings from the provisional governor of Florida that Black citizens should be treated with equality, the 1865-1866 state legislature passed legislation that placed detailed prohibitions and restrictions on African Americans. A committee met prior to the legislative session to recommend that they preserve the “beneficial features of that ‘benign, but much abused and greatly misunderstood institution of slavery” (Shofner, 1977, p. 279). This
legislation preserved the integrity of the old system of oppression and segregation. Shofner (1977) described Florida’s policy thus:

“The delegates to the 1865 constitutional convention and the members of the 1865-1866 legislature who enacted the Florida ‘black code’ had spent their lives as members of the dominant white class in a society whose labor system was based on racial chattel slavery. They brought to their law-making sessions all their past experiences gained from a lifetime acquaintance with a comprehensive ideological and legal framework for racial slavery. They believed that blacks were so mentally inferior and incompetent to order their own affairs that subjection to the superior white race was their natural condition” (Shofner, 1977, p. 278).

This was seen in stricter penalties for crimes, restrictions against intermarriage, laws regulating train travel, inequitable property taxation rates, and forbidding the ownership of weaponry without the permission of a probate judge. This is relevant for understanding Bradenton’s racial history because it is the policy context of law making and social interactions in the South.

Norma Dunwoody lived in Bradenton from 1934 to 1948 until she returned after her retirement in 1999. The Black neighborhood was bordered by 8th Street West, 9th Street East, 13th Avenue on the south, and a zigzag northern boundary that was loosely marked by 8th Avenue East. Although Dunwoody does not recall how the first African American residents came to these neighborhoods, the demographic makeup continued to stay Black because of external and internal pressures. “You didn’t go where you weren’t welcome, and where you see one Black go, another one is going to move in….this is where they came… This is where the living quarters were, and they started working for the White people, and then a cousin came, and they were looking for a place to live, so they’d go to the places where there was the housing. It wasn’t a matter of choice for
looking for a place to live, where you’d look for a place on 24th [Street East] or something. Like I said, [the Black neighborhood] ended on 9th….you didn’t go any further into Manatee than that either. And you sorta’ knew where your limitations lie” (Dunwoody, 2011, Personal Interview). The Black neighborhood boundary crossed the political boundaries of Bradenton and Manatee until the merger in 1943. “East Bradenton did not exist as East Bradenton, it was known as Manatee” (Dunwoody, 2012, Personal Interview). And beyond the easternmost boundary of the neighborhood in the early 1900s, the neighborhood was both White and non-urban. “From 9th Street [East] back I could not go… East of 9th there was all woods” (Dunwoody, 2011, Personal Interview).

Eloise Bacon described a similar experience. “Well, they would live in one house, cause a lot of houses was small—two rooms….If they saw a house larger than what they were living in, they’d ask them how much rent it was, and pay them and move in” Bacon, 2012, Personal Interview). There was no mobility outside of the neighborhood—any moves made were to a better house within the same neighborhood. Census data from this time period in 1930 and 1940 is not available at the neighborhood level. However, the information in the 1940 Census does provide information about the racial, employment, and demographic patterns of Manatee County and the City of Bradenton. 71.36 percent of the 26,098 residents in Manatee County were White and 26.38 percent was Black. Bradenton’s population was 7,444, 76.47 percent White, and 23.52 percent Black. Of the 3,317 non-white employed workers in Manatee County, 55.2 percent of non-white employed workers were farm laborers, and another 35 percent were listed as laborers (except farm). Just 1.5 percent of non-white employed workers were listed as
professional. With a total farm population of 4,556, the rural farm population was 28 percent Negro and 70.1 percent White. There is a slightly higher rate of clustering of African American residents in the precincts of Court House (in Bradenton) and Manatee than the racial percentages countywide. In Manatee 29.56 percent of residents were Black and 68.77 percent White. In the Court House Precinct, the concentration of Black residents was 38 percent and the concentration of White residents was 59.47 percent. Oneco, described as a racially unwelcoming community, had an African American population of just 10.34 percent—well below the County average (U.S. Census, 1940). This confirms the information given by the oral sources, news articles, City archives, and Sanborn maps about the racial location of Black residents. While the African American population of Manatee County was higher in 1940 than it is today, the information about distribution and trades provides statistical confirmation of information about residential and labor patterns provided by other sources.

Black residents of Bradenton were kept in their neighborhood through intimidation. Any residents who wanted to go over the railroad track (less than four blocks south of the Singletary neighborhood) to the City of Oneco were often stopped by a police officer and required to show proof that they were going for employment purposes. ‘Unless you worked out there they weren’t particular about you coming out there. So I don’t know who gave the nickname ‘No n****, ’—they used to call Oneco...Especially when you talk about getting dark, but even in daylight’ (Dunwoody, 2011, Personal Interview).

Clarence Love, a resident of Manatee County since 1929 (with the exception of several years in Tallahassee as a college student) who identified himself as the first Black
elected official on the west coast of Florida, served one term on the Bradenton City
Council from 1975-1979. Despite the provision of community amenities, Bradenton’s
Black neighborhoods were lacking in basic infrastructure—during Councilman Love’s
term in office, some of the streets were paved for the first time. “In our neighborhoods,
there were no paved streets, there were no lights, and there were no sidewalks, and once
you got a Black city councilman that was aware of that, there were other city councilmen
that were aware of that, and you know how politics goes—if you help me with this, I’ll
help you with that” (Love, 2011, Personal Interview).

To the best recollection of one African American community resident (the first
African American homecoming queen at a Bradenton high school in 1969), who “high
tailed it out of” Manatee County immediately after graduation only to return years later,
Black residents did not typically attempt to move to other parts of the city from the
African American neighborhoods. “I don’t know of anybody that was trying to move
into another neighborhood. It was pretty much expanding this area, it wasn’t moving to
the west side—it was on the fringe of the existing neighborhood (Russell, 2009, Personal
Interview). These accounts of neighborhood history are significant because they
indicate that the neighborhood racial and spatial makeup was not organic, but rather a
decision forced on the African American community by external political and social
forces.

Public facilities were segregated. “And they used to have water fountains—you
know where the courthouse is—in the yard, and one was for Coloreds, and one was for
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In “The Failures of Integration: How Class and Race are Undermining The American Dream” Cashin
(2004) discusses integration exhaustion and other reasons why African Americans may choose to live in
African American neighborhoods over integrated ones in great detail. This is a good resource for a
nuanced discussion this study does not have time for.
White” Norma Dunwoody said referencing her time in Bradenton from 1935 -1948 (Dunwoody, 2011, Personal Interview). No exception to the segregation rule was made for African American major league baseball players who came to Bradenton for spring training. Not permitted to stay in the city’s high end hotels, they had to stay in a house in the Black neighborhood.² Despite the spotless housekeeping of the homeowner, Hall of Fame baseball great Hank Aaron criticized the conditions in Bradenton specifically, saying “Sometimes the place is so crowded they have two guys sleeping in the hall. You wake up in the morning and rush for the bathroom and if you’re the last one all the hot water is gone.” A Black player for the Braves criticized the difficulty the situation created for players who wanted to bring their families with them to training. “If any player wants to bring his wife down, it’s pitiful. They see you coming and they want to make a fortune off of you” (Associated Press, 1961).

One resident tied the condition of the infrastructure to the racial attitudes in the City. “These were different times. Blacks were less than citizens. We had Black water fountains in City Hall, Blacks rode the back of the bus, and if they wanted to put you off, they did. …Right up in City Hall, the courthouse—it was Black and White water…I don’t know what that is. It was probably up to the 1960s, I’m sure… Blacks did not have good paying jobs, they worked for probably half of what the Whites worked for… Farm labor in Palmetto was a common job, and service labor, yard work and that type of thing... Our jobs were menial jobs, and I had to work several jobs to make a decent living—at the same time” (Love, 2011, Personal Interview). This has significant

² The article refers to the home as a boarding house, but Norma Dunwoody states that the homeowner Ms. Gibbs did not have a boarding house—it was beneath her social station. Rather, she (and several other families rented to the African-American players when necessary (Norma Dunwoody, 2011, Personal Conversation).
implications for the neighborhoods in the study area. Not only did the City neglect infrastructure investments, Black residents did not earn sufficient wages to make improvements themselves to housing and infrastructure.

Black Manatee County School Board employees were paid at a lower rate than White employees. 1929 meeting minutes show that salary differentials existed for Black and White teachers. No reasons were given for the difference in pay rates (Board of Public Instruction for the County of Manatee State of Florida, 1929). A 1944 petition brought to the City Council by the Colored Taxpayers’ Association for the Improvement of Conditions in the Colored Section of Greater Bradenton asked the Council “To respectfully ask the Council to do away with the unfair salary and vacation differential that has existed between white and colored workers, that is, we urge that the same salary be given colored workers for doing the same works that is given to white workers, and that the same vacation allowance with pay be given Negro workers as is given white workers” (City of Bradenton, 1944). They also requested the hiring of “Negro” police officers to patrol the “Negro Section” and “Negro Sanitary Inspector” for the “colored section” with “powers to enforce sanitary rules among the Negro population” (City of Bradenton, 1944). The pay differentials have implications for the quality of housing stock in the City. This is likely to have impacted the ability of Black residents to purchase and maintain homes at the same level as White residents, particularly if these pay standards extended to the other employers and employment sectors in the city and county.

As Russell (2009, Personal Interview), Love (2011, Personal Interview), and Dunwoody (2011, Personal Interview) have all discussed, there was significant pressure
from White residents on African American residents to live only in certain neighborhoods. Thus, residential segregation may be a preference, but it is not a preference of Black homebuyers and renters (as research by Thomas, 1997; Bobo, et al 2000; Sjoquist, 2000; Cashin, 2004 indicates. Thus, with insufficient capital investment in neighborhoods that were becoming more concentrated with Black residents, the impact on the racial spatial layout of City neighborhoods is significant.

The Klu Klux Klan had a presence in Bradenton. The White owner of a grocery store was a Klan member—neighborhood children identified him when his Klan hood slipped off (Dunwoody, 2011). Manatee County Sheriff Roy Baden provided escort for a group of Tampa Klansmen who rode through from Palmetto to the “Negro Section.” Although the sheriff had been ordered to stop the Klan at the border to the Black neighborhood, Sheriff Baden intervened and provided escort (Sarasota Herald Tribune, 1958a). Although the Mayor and governor reprimanded Sheriff Baden (Sarasota Herald Tribune, 1958b), his only issue with his handling of the situation was that it provided national publicity to the Klan.

Though the earliest boundaries of the African American neighborhood did not go beyond 9th Street East, this gradually changed. While the current East Bradenton neighborhood within the study area is largely African American in composition, it has not always been that way. William Logan was a resident of East Bradenton within the study area on 15th Street East and 7th Avenue Drive from 1955 to 1974. “When we first moved in, I don’t remember any blacks or Hispanics—basically it was all White. It was possible there was somebody there, but I never saw them. I’d say that it was all White… I don’t ever remember seeing any Black families in the neighborhood… I don’t remember any
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Black kids at Manatee Elementary. I went there from ’55-'61. I don’t remember seeing any either at school or in the neighborhood” (Logan, 2012, Personal Interview). He noted that when Black families moved into a nearby Section 8 development, White families began to move out (Logan, 2011, Personal Conversation). “Beyond 9th Street East was where the White folks lived, and there was a crate mill there when I was in high school. The big White section was there, and farther down east there… Had to be in the 50s, as we began to be able to move into those areas, probably when they built Avondale [apartments] in that area [in the early 1970s], because Whites didn’t want to live next to Blacks because they contaminated the area, so when Blacks moved in they began to move” (Love, 2012, Personal Conversation). When one resident moved to the East Bradenton neighborhood near the East Bradenton Pool in 1963, she said that there was an existing non-subdivision neighborhood as well as the Regent Park subdivision. At this time, the Tropicana juice manufacturing plant was very small, rather than the large scale operation it is today (Byrd, 2012, Personal Interview).

The zoning and neighborhood platting east of 9th Street East in East Bradenton was mixed in the timing and form of its implementation. “Right around the corner from me was mostly professional people, the Pearcy’s—one of the Pearcy brothers was an instructor at the University of Florida... They wanted to build and that land was available for them… [US] 41 was separating east and west, and that land was available for them. Over there at the corner was Pelot’s, and that was the hub of Bradenton.” (Byrd, 2012, Personal Interview). East Bradenton plats were laid in 1890, 1894, 1913, 1925, 1926, 1947, 1954, and 1961—an incomplete listing to be certain, but a thorough sample, nonetheless. Despite the significant number of neighborhoods that were platted in the
earliest days of Bradenton, large tracts of land were vacant in East Bradenton until the 1960s. This allowed for the expansion of the African American community as residents, property owners, and governments sought to expand housing opportunities for Black residents. One example of this is a land use change in the 1900 block of 13th Avenue East (located in the East Bradenton neighborhoods of the study area). A property owner wanted to relocate his home to a nearby piece of land, zoned agriculture. The Manatee County Commission required the property owner to rezone this 4.2 acre tract of land to residential before they allowed him to move his house eight blocks east. The Commission and the neighbors feared the property owner would bring the Black migrant labor contractors with him (St. Petersburg Times, 1969). These types of pressures drew neighborhoods that were not historically African American neighborhoods into the Black community.

Manatee County schools were not desegregated until 1970 when a federal order mandated a unification of the county school districts with an immediate action plan to improve integration by busing (Kohlman, 1970). Florida Gov. Claude Kirk defied these orders to bus students, dismissed the school board, and had a public showdown with federal marshals at the public high school (Time, 1970). The support from White residents for Gov. Kirk’s actions was significant, with the Chairman of the County Commission and the Mayor of Bradenton expressing public support, along with businessmen and citizens (Bowden and Fleischer, 1970). The City of Bradenton passed a resolution declaring opposition to busing as a solution to segregation, citing lack of educational and social benefits (City of Bradenton, 1970a).
Citizens’ councils played a dominant role in the promotion of segregation. The Manatee County Citizens Council (MCCC) and Save Our Neighborhood Sons (SONS) [later changing its name to Freedom of Choice (FOC)] were active both locally and regionally. In 1970, SONS held a meeting at the local Kiwanis Hall, attended by 300 parents rallying against school integration. A state senator and a state representative were in attendance in support of integration (Sarasota Journal, 1970a). This same state senator was hired as an attorney for SONS/FOC, who had 500 members within a week of its formation. MCCC worked with other citizens to create four new private schools as a response to school integration (St. Petersburg Times, 1970). In 1973 the MCCC worked with Sarasota to oppose an open housing ordinance and the creation of a community relations board (Sarasota Herald Tribune, 1973). A Manatee County Citizens Council President spoke to the Bartow Concerned Citizens’ League in 1984. Even though he was scheduled to speak on local and national issues, his presence attracted negative attention because of a newspaper advertisement published by MCCC which “condemns school desegregation, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1965 Voting Rights Act, racial hiring quotas, and ‘welfare recipients who load fancy new automobiles with expensive steaks and hams,” as well as a quote from the organization’s president which stated “We don’t believe racial integrity can be preserved unless the races are kept separate in the traditional Southern manner” (Lakeland Ledger, 1984). The African American community had various social and community institutions that fought against segregation and for desegregation. The Negro Chamber of Commerce, which worked to place African American patrolmen on the police force (St. Petersburg Times, 1957c); the Colored Taxpayers’ Association for the Improvement of Conditions in the Colored
Section of Greater Bradenton (City of Bradenton, 1944), the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (St. Petersburg Times, 1958a); and the Negro Civic and Business Men’s League of Manatee County (Sarasota Herald Tribune, 1954), but because they were competing against local organizations who often had the strength and support of federal and state law, they were not as effective as they could have been.

**Public Facilities**

Even in the provision of amenities, public officials built them as structures of segregation. Along with the provision of segregated housing, the City provided a Black swimming facility. The development of the pool was tied to the existence of segregated beaches. “The reason we have the East Bradenton swimming pool is because Blacks was not allowed on the beach. So they built the East Bradenton swimming pool for Blacks” (Clarence Love, 2011, Personal Interview). Indeed, the Bradenton Beach City Council and Island Chamber of Commerce went on record to oppose a Negro beach and threatened legal action if the Manatee County Public Beach Commission cited the beach in their jurisdiction (Sarasota Herald Tribune, 1954). When the pool was approved in 1957, a delegate of the recreation center where the pool would be installed ironically “praised Manatee County as being ‘unlike any other in the country, in that relations between the races here is better than anywhere I’ve been.’” He went on to applaud “the beach commission for providing for Negro recreation ‘without us coming begging for it’” (Sarasota Herald Tribune, 1957). The pool was eventually completed in 1964 as an exclusively Black facility (St. Petersburg Times, 1964).

Another key facility impacted by segregation was the corner of 13th Avenue West and 1st Street designated by the City as a recreation area for African American residents.
The National Youth Administration (a New Deal Agency) requested that the Council sign a fifteen year lease with them for land to be used for a “negro recreation center” building (City of Bradenton, 1937). The project was funded in a partnership with the City, the National Youth Administration, and the Negro Womens Club of Bradenton (City of Bradenton, 1938). Then, in 1954 the City deeded land to the Public Housing Authority, and portions of that land were leased to the “Colored Women’s Club” and “Designated and dedicated as a Negro recreational park area to be used exclusively by the Negro Citizens of the City of Bradenton for such recreational and park purposes as the City Council of the City of Bradenton shall from time to time designate” (City of Bradenton, 1954). Thus, both federal and local policies seem to have determined the development of a site specifically for African Americans.

To the west of the community center facility at 7th or 8th Street West along 13th Avenue, the Bradenton Nine Devils (a professional baseball team in the Florida State Negro League) had a field next to the location of the McKechnie Field, the current spring training home of the Pittsburg Pirates. African American residents were not allowed to attend games. “When I was growing up the St. Louis Cardinals was the team. And we definitely couldn’t go into that park, so they definitely wouldn’t let no Blacks in there to hit balls on it to mess up their field” (Dunwoody, 2011, Personal Interview).

Summary

Racial separation and hostility has a lengthy history in Bradenton and Manatee County. The demographics show that separation exists, and multiple sources show the social processes involved in the development of segregation. The next section will discuss the role of public policy in developing Bradenton into a patchwork city.
Chapter 5: Public Policies

Manatee County and the City of Bradenton have experienced many of the same factors that literature shows have caused center city decline in other metropolitan areas (Hall, 2002). Race, poor planning policy, and federal highway and housing policy have converged to create center city decline as centripetal policy forces drove resources away from city centers. The policies of City, County, State, and federal governments have worked to support the effectiveness of each of the other jurisdictions. The details of each jurisdiction’s policies will help explain their impact on the quality of life in CCRA neighborhoods.

**Florida Planning Policy**

The development of the patchwork city seems to be closely related to the absence of state controlled planning. Until legislative changes in 2011, Florida growth management was dominated by state control that required strong consistency between jurisdictions, multiple levels of governmental oversight, and multiple governmental levels of plan preparations. This has not always been the case, however (Gale, 1992). Florida adopted its monumental, statewide, 1985 Growth Management Act as the primary shaper of growth management policy, and this legislation was predated by earlier legislation such as the Florida Air and Water Pollution Control Act (1967), the County and Municipal Planning for Future Development Act (1969), the Beach and Shore Preservation Act (1971), the Florida Environmental Land and Water Management Act (1972), the Florida Water Resources Act (1972); the Florida State Comprehensive
Planning Act (1972), and the Land Conservation Act (1972) (DeGrove, 2005). The 1975 Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Act laid the groundwork for the 1985 Growth Management Act. Together, these worked towards a comprehensive, integrated land regulation system that coordinated local, regional and state efforts (Nicholas & Steiner, 2000). All of these pieces of legislation set a precedent for the state as the arbiter of land use and development controls, but their short history allowed rapid development that was very different from existing development, particularly the neighborhoods in the study area. In Bradenton, this elevated the quality of infrastructure and amenities in new neighborhoods to a level that older neighborhoods could not compete with—particularly the African American neighborhoods that were deteriorated by apathetic planning implementation.

Developments of Regional Impact (DRIs), consistency, concurrency, and adequate public facilities requirements are significant tools in the Florida planning policy framework, and they played a significant role in making Bradenton a patchwork city. DRIs were adopted as part of the 1972 Land and Water Management Act. Any large commercial center, power plant, or housing project that would have a significant impact on the health, safety, and welfare of citizens of multiple counties were subjected to a multiple, regional agency review process, with the final approval left to the local government (Kelly, 2004). The DRI legislation, combined with the totality of GMA policy, promoted the development of new neighborhoods at greater distances from Bradenton’s center city neighborhoods. A map of DRIs in Manatee County (Appendix I) illustrates how their spatial layout and distance from the center city has promoted a patchwork community.
The GMA also has contributed to the development of Bradenton as a patchwork city. Codified in Chapter 163, Part II of Florida Statutes, the GMA legislation was revolutionary because it created a framework for the consistent, mandated implementation of standardized growth and planning policy in every municipality across the state (Ben-Zadok, 2008). After the adoption of the GMA, all municipalities, counties, and regional planning councils were required to adopt comprehensive plans that were subject to review for compliance and consistency of policy by the Department of Community Affairs and Division of Community Planning and a number of state agencies (DCA, 2010). Ben-Zadok (2008) evaluated the GMA in terms of what he describes as the three major policies, or the “3Cs,” of the GMA: consistency, concurrency, and compact development. Consistency policy “mandates co-ordination, compliance and continuity among state, regional and local plans. This tri-level review process grants the state with ultimate authority to intervene in land development decisions, power almost entirely left to localities in the past” (Ben-Zadok, 2008, p.2168). Concurrency policy is designed to influence the volume and pace of development by mandating that capital improvements in public facilities “should be available ‘concurrent’ with the impact of development” (Ben-Zadok, 2008, p. 2168). Compact development policy was designed to “restrain urban and suburban developments from spreading towards natural resources and agricultural lands and instead to direct growth to urban areas of mixed land uses and high densities” (Ben-Zadock, 2008, p. 2168). Even with these policy improvements to the growth management system, however, Carruthers (2002) identified weak consistency requirements and enforcement mechanisms as significant factors in promoting sprawl.
These policies are significant in understanding the lack of competitiveness of the City of Bradenton’s center city neighborhoods in comparison to the healthier Bradenton neighborhoods and new suburban growth with better infrastructure that took place throughout Manatee County. Florida’s loose planning culture allowed municipalities such as Bradenton to employ lackadaisical and inconsistent policy implementation until the 1970s. The neighborhoods planned under this regime were not all subjected to a unified development review process. This resulted in neighborhoods with varying quality and form. Then, with the implementation of the GMA in 1985, the newer neighborhoods that developed had the advantage of providing Manatee County residents with infrastructure and amenities that were not as easily accessible in the City. While the focus of this paper is not suburbanization, or a criticism of suburbanization, it is important to develop a cursory understanding of the role of Manatee County’s suburbanization policy in the study of Bradenton center city decline. The DRI process and the belated implementation of meaningful comprehensive planning allowed rapid growth of new, well-planned housing developments with well-developed amenities, while the existing neighborhoods in urban cores (with their lack of planning and amenities) sit in stark contrast.

**Bradenton Planning Policy**

While the City of Bradenton had zoning and planning prior to the 1972 Comprehensive Plan, there was not a comprehensive planning policy or a dedicated effort to enforce consistent, coherent policy in all neighborhoods prior to that point. In 1948, a resolution making provision for the improvement of sanitary sewer treatment and management in the East Bradenton neighborhoods referred to the existence of a sewage
Master Plan, but there is no indication that this master planning extended to the City as a whole (City of Bradenton, 1948). Many individuals interviewed were not aware of the existence of zoning and planning policies, and most stakeholders were not aware of the location of early planning documents.

**Early zoning policy.** The first plat of the City was registered in 1898 and was laid in strict grid form (Appendix G). Located within the study area, these thirteen different plats listed below were platted early in the city’s history (Appendix H). Although there are additional plats throughout the study area, the focus of this study is not a comprehensive land use analysis. Rather, these plats show that land use planning was used in these neighborhoods. Other evidence from news archives shows that enforcement of land development code was inconsistent and problematic, but these plat records show that a system of land management did exist early in Bradenton’s history.

**Table 3: Study Area Plats**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plat Filed</th>
<th>Plat Name</th>
<th>CRA Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Vanderipe</td>
<td>E Bradenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Vanderipe WH</td>
<td>E Bradenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Pinedale</td>
<td>East Bradenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Vanderipe Ives Addition</td>
<td>E Bradenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Perry Park</td>
<td>E Bradenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Booker T Washington Homesteads</td>
<td>E Bradenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Bryant Park</td>
<td>E Bradenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Regent Park</td>
<td>E Bradenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Mrs. Julia Curry Plat</td>
<td>Washington Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Southern Investment Company</td>
<td>Washington Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Johnson Bros Sub</td>
<td>Washington Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Lincoln Heights</td>
<td>Washington Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Sharps Addition</td>
<td>Washington Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Singletary</td>
<td>Singletery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This grid style of planning was consistent in the oldest Bradenton neighborhoods, regardless of racial composition. Throughout the city prior to WWII and the implementation of the 1985 Growth Management Act (GMA), the older neighborhoods of Bradenton were laid out using Euclidian grid-style zoning—all planning was done within the confines of the grid system. The grid system began to loosen with the adoption of clean water and water use laws related to volume, which impacted land use patterns (Osborne, 2009, Personal Interview).

The first zoning policy available on record in the city is 1925, although the 1925 ordinance is an amendment to a previous ordinance that was not available in City archives. This ordinance regulated the location of businesses and industries, and the location of buildings for special uses. The ordinance established five different zoning districts: Business District “A,” Business District “B,” Industrial District, Residence District “A,” and Residence District “B” (City of Bradenton, 1925). The planning and zoning policy in the following years theoretically provided for well-formed and regulated neighborhoods. In 1926 a waste treatment code was enacted (City of Bradenton, 1926b), a revision to the existing building code was passed in 1926 (City of Bradenton, 1926a), and an electrical code was enacted in 1927 (City of Bradenton, 1927). In each pursuant decade, the City enacted zoning and planning policy that regulated land use, building quality, and sanitary structures.

Despite perceptions that there were no codes governing the development of housing and neighborhoods, there was a fairly comprehensive City comprehensive land code adopted in 1940. The City enacted a 70-page comprehensive zoning ordinance that defined permissible residential and commercial uses within established districts, building
form, density, lot and yard sizes, and building locations. These districts were One (Single) Family District “R-1,” Two Family District “R-2,” Multiple Family District “R-3,” Commercial District “C-1,” Commercial District “C-2,” and Manufacturing District “M-1.” The purpose of this was “to divide the City of Bradenton into districts of such number, shape and areas as may be best suited to carry out these regulations.” The borders of the zoning districts were not described in the ordinance, but it clearly defined the lot allowances, permissible structures, density, and lot design by district (City of Bradenton, 1940). In 1945 the City extended its zoning to Manatee when the territory was annexed (City of Bradenton, 1945).

The 1950s saw an increase in the implementation of additional planning and building codes. The greatest number of recorded zoning ordinances was passed in the 1950s and 1960s. Twenty ordinances are available in the digital record from the 1950s, and thirty zoning ordinances are available in the digital record from the 1960s. Local planning institutions were not created until the 1960s and 1970s. In 1962 the City created a planning board—which was replaced with the implementation of a prior ordinance not available in the record (City of Bradenton, 1962). The City created the Planning Commission in 1970 by Ordinance 1102 (City of Bradenton, 1970). It was also during this time period that the City entered into regional planning efforts and began to take advantage of federal funding channeled through the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council (TBRPC) to implement improvement projects (City of Bradenton, 1969d; City of Bradenton, 1969e; City of Bradenton, 1969f).

In 1974, the City adopted its first Comprehensive Plan. The three-volume comprehensive plan addressed administrative organization and planning coordination,
citizen involvement and education, and City housing plan review. The administrative portion of the plan reviewed existing government structures, land use and development regulations, procedural organizations, and functional coordination of the development process. The housing element set parameters for building and housing code enforcement and compliance, planning and land use implementation, neighborhood development, and public housing (Milo Smith & Associates, 1974). Modifications to the comprehensive plan were passed in 1989, 2001, and 2010 (City of Bradenton, 1989; City of Bradenton, 2001; City of Bradenton, 2010).

The impact of this policy (or lack of policy) had a significant impact on the quality of housing stock and neighborhood layout in the neighborhoods of the Central CRA in comparison to the other neighborhoods of the City. Even though there was zoning and planning code on the books, there was a perception among African American residents of the study area and former planning officials that it did not exist until the creation of the City Planning Department in the early 1970s. Planning and zoning enforcement appears to have been only loosely enforced in the City and County prior to the passage of the Florida State Comprehensive Planning Act (1972) and the Growth Management Act of 1985. “They wrote the zoning on a piece of paper, that was it. Nobody checked to see if it was followed. Nobody knew who was doing what,” Jerry West said of the early days of the Manatee County Planning Department (Jerry West, 2011, Personal Interview). While the City of Bradenton performed planning, zoning, and code enforcement functions, it did not have a planning department until the early 1970s. One of the earliest directors of the Planning Department was not aware of the date of the earliest zoning codes. “I don’t really know but if I had a guess, I’d say right after World
The City had loose planning, zoning, and code enforcement in the early years of the City, with varying degrees of enforcement in the different neighborhoods in the City. “I truly don’t think there were no codes almost anywhere. The advantage that the Whites had was that they had professional builders who know how to build things correct, and they didn’t care how they built things over here [in the Black neighborhood]… Out of ignorance” (Clarence Love, 2011, Personal Interview). He clarified that many of the issues with the quality of buildings were related to the capacity of the builders, not a lack of code. “Not really that. In the other community there was just building better… We had unskilled labor, people were just living as best we could, but the Southern Standard Code changed that and got rid of the old houses” (Love, 2012, Personal Interview). There is a strong perception that the City did not have any laws pertaining to neighborhood housing design. “No, they didn’t have any laws; they did exactly what they wanted to do. If the law was there, they never paid any attention to it. They might have one lot, and put three houses on it, or four—as many as they could get on it” one lifelong resident of the Singletary neighborhood noted (Bacon, 2012, Personal Interview).

Despite the neighborhood plats that were filed for the Black neighborhoods in the study area, this did not translate to good neighborhood infrastructure. “There was only about—approximately four paved streets in the entire Black community. 13th Avenue, 11th Avenue—over by the Covington’s—and 11th Avenue ends at the railroad track—so 11th Avenue, then 9th Avenue and 9th Street… And Manatee was the other paved street. They were the only paved streets in the Black community” (Dunwoody, 2011, Personal Interview). As for streetlights—“There wasn’t that many” (Dunwoody, 2011, Personal Interview).
Interview). Basic infrastructure existed in the White neighborhoods however. “White streets? Most of them were paved. I remember going with my great grandmother…She worked for her White people…I’d say about 26th Street [where the family she worked for lived]—because we walked there--pretty much all of that was paved… Most of their streets were paved” (Dunwoody, 2011, Personal Interview). The Taxpayers’ Association for the Improvement of Conditions in the Colored Section of Greater Bradenton petitioned the City Council to improve the infrastructure in the Black neighborhood. They asked for the widening or paving of number of streets within the district; hard surfaces and grading to improve water drainage and reduce flooding on other streets; the provision of water and sanitary facilities in the Manatee “Negro Section;” and the provision of water, lights, and grounds services at the Black community center. The Council responded to the request by accepting it for further consideration (City of Bradenton, 1944). It appears that this appeal was only partially successful because many streets within the study area were not paved until the 1970s (Love, 2011, Personal Interview). By 1962, a complete drainage and sewer system had been installed in the “Negro section,” something Mayor Hall described with great pride saying “No matter what our conditions are, we’re far ahead of any other city” (Sarasota Journal, 1962).

Sanborn Fire Insurance Co. Maps are available for 1911, 1915, 1922, 1926, and 1929 in Bradenton, and 1922, 1926, and 1929 in Manatee (now East Bradenton). These maps provide information about the density and racial development patterns of the study area. The 1911 Sanborn maps do not indicate the presence of Black businesses, churches, schools, or residential structures in the study area. However, by 1915 the Sanborn maps began to show the presence of these institutions (See Appendices J-Q).
The information on these maps is important for several reasons. First, they show that the current racial demographics of the neighborhood developed at least as early as 1915. Second, the maps show that separate Black institutions existed within the study area very early on—as other sources have indicated. Third, these maps are limited in their historical reach because they only show the presence of buildings with water and gas infrastructure. One of the oldest churches, St. Paul Missionary Baptist Church, was located at 6th Avenue and 10th Street East (in Washington Park) in 1886 before it moved to its current home along the Martin Luther King Avenue corridor (St. Paul Missionary Baptist Church, No Date). Finally, they show that there is very little consistency of lot size, density, and structure size in the neighborhoods in the study area or comparison neighborhoods.

Building and housing code. The City had building and housing code in place that theoretically should have contributed to the development of a seamless city. Between 1926 and 1968, City of Bradenton records show that a significant number of building, plumbing, electric, and waste management codes were implemented. Bradenton Mayor-Elect Hall listed drainage infrastructure in the “Negro quarter” as “a situation I deplore. It is more than a health problem—it is a disgrace (St. Petersburg Times, 1957h). Later in 1962, Mayor Hall decried the housing conditions in the study area, saying “When you live in a hog pen, what’s to stop you from throwing more slop on the floor?” and went on to say that “Living in these substandard dwellings destroys incentive, creates filth, bad health problems and immorality,” blaming the crime and other problems on the housing conditions (Alexander, 1962). Some residents of the study area recalled a different experience than that described by Mayor Hall, and described the
maintenance of the neighborhood with pride (Bacon, 2012, Personal Interview). “It was my job, every Saturday morning to wash the front porch and water the flowers—our front porch was so clean you could eat off of it” (Dunwoody, 2011, Personal Interview). There seems to be a strong relationship between construction quality and housing conditions, rather than resident living habits. Approximately 1,000 houses were condemned by the Bradenton Housing Authority in the African American neighborhoods of the city (St. Petersburg Times, 1951). Issues like these with the infrastructure in the study area served as political drivers for the implementation of sanitary codes as the public grew concerned with the slum conditions.3

Several substandard housing ordinances were enacted to improve the condition of City housing in the 1960s. Much of this deteriorated housing was within the study area. In 1964, Ordinance 963 was passed which authorized the City to reimburse property owners for the demolition costs (City of Bradenton, 1964c). Ordinance 1029 established a Sub Standard Housing Board in 1968 (City of Bradenton, 1968b). Ordinance 1063 established a Department of Substandard Housing and Community Improvement in 1969 (City of Bradenton, 1969b). In 1969, Ordinance 1067 amended Ordinance 1029 to give the Substandard Housing Board the authority to hear appeals to citations given by building inspectors (City of Bradenton, 1969c). While the City enacted codes to address the substandard housing, the scope of the problem and pushback from landlords regarding enforcement prevented the policy from having significant impact.

3 The exact number and street location of the condemned units is not certain. It was determined that they are within the study area. The Bradenton housing authority did not keep minutes until the late 1990s, and to the best of my knowledge there are no records from the Substandard Housing Board at that time.
As late as the 1970s, the ordinances against slum housing were not enforced. Controversy over the building code arose when a storm severely damaged houses in the 44 Quarters, a set of structures within the Washington Park neighborhood owned by a City Planning Commission member. Despite the strong stance against substandard housing by the City building inspector, no action was taken in this neighborhood to remedy the poor housing conditions. A post-storm inspection revealed “paper-thin walls, many with holes, and broken boards on porches, all lacking paint” (Sarasota Journal, 1977). These types of ongoing issues with deteriorated housing stock show that the presence of building code did not necessarily result in sound structures.

**Southern standard housing code.** Between 1954 and 1970, the City adopted ten different Southern Standard Code ordinances and resolutions. These ordinances included the Southern Standard Building Code, the Southern Standard Plumbing Code, and the Southern Standard Housing Code. These ordinances ranged in purpose from the adoption of the full code to adoption of the new housing element, storm sewer regulations, awning regulations, and appointments to the Housing Board of Adjustments and Appeals. A driver of the adoption of this code seemed to be the City’s application for Department of Housing and Urban Development Funding. In 1968, the City’s recertification of a workable program was contingent upon public participation in the Substandard Housing Board, a comprehensive neighborhood analysis, and updating of city building, electric, and plumbing codes (Sarasota Herald Tribune, 1968). One resident of the study area felt that the implementation of these codes had a racial motive: “They needed to meet basic standards… The whole story is that the basic standards, the powers that be, were not interested in providing us with anything, but the women said, ‘Look, these people are
cooking for us, taking care of our babies, we need to make sure that we keep them healthy and provide them stuff” (Clarence Love, 2011, Personal Interview).

The 1953-1954 Southern Standard Building Code stated that it “shall apply to the construction, alteration, repair, equipment, use and occupancy, location, maintenance, removal and demolition, of every building or structure or any appurtenances connected or attached to such buildings or structures” (Southern Standard Building Code, 1953/1954). In a very comprehensive code system, the code addressed topics such as air intake and ventilation, water, windows, permissible building materials, permitting, construction, fire codes, roofing, plumbing, required toilets, flooring, footers, foundations, design, and occupancy requirements. In 1954, the City adopted the 1953-1954 Southern Standard Building Code, and ordinances were passed approving updated versions of the code in 1957, 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1969 (City of Bradenton, 1953-1954; City of Bradenton, 1957; City of Bradenton, 1964a; City of Bradenton, 1965a; City of Bradenton, 1965b; City of Bradenton, 1966; City of Bradenton, 1969). A separate 1964 City Southern Standard Code amended provisions for the drainage connection of sanitary sewers (City of Bradenton, 1964b). A 1968 City ordinance adopted the 1965 Southern Standard Gas Code, and modified the existing plumbing, housing, building code (City of Bradenton, 1968). In 1970, the City appointed seven individuals to the Housing Board of Adjustments and Appeals as a requirement of the Southern Standard Housing Code. This board took over the duties of the Substandard Housing Board previously created in 1969 (City of Bradenton, 1970d).

The implementation of the code was met with political opposition by property owners who thought the code was too restrictive. A Bradenton attorney lodged a
complaint to the Bradenton City Council and substandard housing board about the enforcement of the Southern Standard Code. The primary complaint was that the enforcement was a matter of esthetics, rather than health, safety and welfare. The attorney noted that the Southern Standard Building Code was in place prior to the Southern Standard Housing Code, which was only adopted to meet requirements of federal substandard housing programs. Furthermore he indicated a belief that the creators of the Southern Standard Housing Code did not intend for strict implementation or entry for inspections without warrants (Sarasota Journal, 1970b). This is important to note because the existence of planning and housing codes does not necessarily imply implementation or enforcement. This, and other sources, indicates that the City placed a low priority on policy enforcement within the study area. This led to deteriorated infrastructure, as interviews and documents have indicated.

Transportation Infrastructure

Manatee County and Bradenton had a significant railroad network. In 1887 the first railroad was built in the county and stretched from Arcadia to Punta Gorda (in what are now Desoto and Charlotte Counties). In 1891, the Arcadia, Gulf Coast, and Lakeland Railroads built a station around 14th Street in Bradenton, and a station was built in Oneco in 1892. The first permanent railroad came to the County in 1902 with the Seaboard Air Line, and despite the decline in the use of trains for the use of passenger travel with the rise of the automobile, trains continued to be used for freight through 1925 even after freight tax legislation was passed (Gibson, 1985).

US 301 and US 41 were the main traffic arteries until I-75 was completed in the early 1980s. This had a negative impact on the center city because the new highway
drew traffic away from the primary traffic carriers and caused businesses to falter (Osborne, 2009, Personal Interview). Financing for the entire interstate project was projected to be paid for out of federal funds (Curtis, 1980). This policy was not a city policy, but it impacted the city tremendously. While these processes took place later than in large northern cities, federal highway subsidies were a centripetal force in the downfall of the economy of center city neighborhoods because they facilitated movement to new development and away from aging infrastructure at the same time that the GMA and DRI policy contributed to the ease of suburban development.

Summary

Rather than creating neighborhoods that flowed together seamlessly, these policies resulted in the development of neighborhoods of patchy quality. It is expected that land development code will allow for variety and diversity of development, but the planning policy framework and context converged to have a negative impact on the quality of the study area neighborhoods.
Chapter 6: The Genesis of Center City Decline in Bradenton

African Americans did not benefit from the policy and planning framework created by the City, County, State of Florida, and the federal government. This section will discuss how these neighborhoods developed as they did.

Housing Policy

News articles indicate a strong belief that African Americans belonged in segregated neighborhoods. Furthermore, local policy used the support of federal funds to create separate Black and White public housing. This decision to use federal funds to support segregated housing was supported and enforced by federal housing policy at the time (and discussed in greater detail in Chapter 1). City public housing investments with federal dollars were for Black or white housing, but never integrated housing. Articles use the language “Negro housing” repeatedly, and refer to it as an assumed and appropriate concept, and federal dollars were used for that purpose (St. Petersburg Times, 1964; Blizin, 1958; St. Petersburg Times, 1957b, St. Petersburg Times, 1952). Public officials saw a need to create solutions to slum housing in the African American neighborhoods in the city that included long range plans and zoning restrictions to address substandard housing. In the 1950s and 1960s, the City of Bradenton pursued federal aid to do so (St. Petersburg Times, 1957a; Blizin, 1958; St. Petersburg Times, 1964a).

Much of the early development of Black housing in the study area was driven by several private citizens. “There were several people that owned old housing—Reasoners
was one—he owned the Red Quarters and the 44 Quarters” (Love, 2011, Personal Interview). Prior to the public housing, African American housing development was not developed with supervision. In fact, its development was so unregulated that it led to the illusion that there was no housing code or planning code. “There wasn’t no developments as we have today. Blacks couldn’t get houses… The Singletary’s probably built them… Before the 60s Blacks didn’t have no status… Mr. Singletary would build houses for his favorites, but people who were carpenters and knew the rudimentary skills would build them. But most houses were owned by absentee landlords. And that contributed to a serious problem in the area because he did not live in the area, he lived somewhere else… Because they were not there, they did not live there, they were not a part of the neighborhood…they lived west of 9th Street, they just came out collected the money and put it in the bank. That was just not here. That was everywhere. And of course they had no codes. The City was not interested in Blacks. There was no Mexicans” (Love, 2011, Personal Interview).

Evidence also shows that African American neighborhoods were sometimes proposed with smaller lot sizes, with 96 50’ x 70’ residential lots and two 140’ frontage commercial lots proposed on the 10 acre development. It was intended to receive financing through the federal funding provided for the 120 unit public housing project adjacent to the youth center on 13th Avenue (in the Singletary Neighborhood). African American residents unsuccessfully opposed the layout of this development on the grounds of lot size, but Bradenton’s Mayor objected on the grounds that “there isn’t a tract of land in the city available at this time for a development of this nature.” It is not clear if the private portion of the project was completed (St. Petersburg Times, 1957b).
However, it is clear that many felt that developments of that nature belonged in very specific neighborhoods. While the City applied for federal dollars to build segregated public housing, they did not support Black community leaders in building their own new housing development. Mayor Hall indicated that “the City is definitely interested” in using Federal Housing and Finance Agency dollars for slum clearance in the Negro quarter, but the City Council “had to refuse” a request for assistance from leaders from the quarter with finding land for a subdivision because “no area may be designated for a specific race” (St. Petersburg Times, 1957a). While there were houses of varying sizes—some with multiple rooms—the majority of the houses in the study area were small and lacking quality. “The houses were, I’d say, shotgun houses. Some of them were open spaces, and some people partition off the inside of the house. It may have been one room say, and they would hang blankets or sheets up to divide the room to sleep up and places and things like that... It all depends on where you rented. Some of the houses, it looked like you would say, ‘Foof’ and it would fall down” (Dunwoody, 2011, Personal Interview). Another community resident provides a more favorable description of the available housing stock. “They were mostly rented houses, but they were well kept, not by the owners, but by the people who lived in them, the renters… They were dirt roads” (Bacon, 2012, Personal Interview).

One of the neighborhoods most impacted by poor housing quality was the Washington Park Neighborhood within the study area. “That 44 Quarters—that was a huge building that those absentee landlords built... Over just west of there [Robinson Apartments] everything was quarters. Blacks could not get financing, so those guys—Reasoner’s, Singletary—built a lot of houses. Shacks, really, and that’s what the people
lived in… Yeah, Singletary was one of them. And if you worked for him or something, he’d put you in a halfway house, not a good house” (Love, 2012, Personal Interview).

The origin of the term quarters is not clear, but Love (2012, Personal Interview) provided an explanation that had roots in the history of race relations. “It was a carryover from slavery. If you worked for a farmer, he had a settlement, and you lived in his quarter… If you worked on a farm, that was his quarters.” Given the work of Shofner (1977) on the Black Code in Florida, this is an area of research that should be explored further.

The first Bradenton Housing Authority project was created for “low income Negro families,” and “a companion project for low income white families” was developed later (Sarasota Herald Tribune, 1962). These 70 White public housing units faced opposition from neighborhoods throughout the City, but were eventually located within the East Bradenton neighborhood at 9th Avenue and 20th Street East (St. Petersburg Times, 1958b). Even though the project was designated as White, it brought many concerns that it would one day become a mixed race project, and further lead to school integration. Bradenton Mayor Sterling Hall averted negative public opinion by warning residents of the inevitability of school integration. “We might as well face it. All our school children some of these days are going to have to be integrated. Mind you, I’m not for it, but when the courts make us do it, we will or go to jail.” He did not, however, foresee the integration of housing. We’re not talking about Negro housing and there isn’t an integrated project in the entire state of Florida.” The City was so against the concept of integrated public housing, that he proposed the sale of the project (as permitted by law) if integration became a threat (St. Petersburg Times, 1958c). This source is important for several reasons. It shows that federal policy supported the development of segregated
housing. Second, it shows that local support drove the location and demographics of public housing. Third, it shows that in the 1950s, the eastern portion of the East Bradenton neighborhood seems to have still been largely White demographically.

Despite the fire that killed six African American children in a (condemned) house in the quarter, “to the prominent Bradenton families who own these dwellings, they are neither shacks nor hog pens.” ‘We provide decent houses for the Negroes at prices they can afford,’ one of them said” (Alexander, 1962). In a one square mile area in Bradenton’s East Side, and an estimated 3,000 Black residents—or “Negroes”—(75% of the city’s Black population) lived in 500 houses in substandard condition. The houses were seven room single family, to duplexes, apartments, and 36-room migrant rooming houses. Five families were the primary owners of the African American housing in the study area and none of them were landlords as their principal occupations. Only 10% of the 500 substandard housing units condemned in the wake of the 1950 housing ordinance was torn down because the City was concerned with damaging the profit potential of these landlords who were concerned with the costs associated with improvements. The owners of the properties claimed that the collections losses, utilities, taxes, and insurance costs made property ownership much more challenging than the value of the properties made it appear. Property owners expressed a strong preference for making low-cost repairs. One owner stated a preference for moving railroad shacks to his properties and repairing them, rather than building new rental properties. Another expressed concern with passing a mortgage onto his grandchildren. The houses that were brought up to code only had to add electric, plumbing, and inside toilets, but were not required to cover cracks in the walls, replace tin roofs, or add walking space between shacks. Despite the
250 units that had been built by the Bradenton Housing Authority, Mayor Hall said that “it’s not the city’s job to provide residential areas for anyone. All we can do is cooperate with developers.” However, as of 1962 the City did not have the federally required workable plan, which would require city legislative action and vote by the city electorate (Alexander, 1962). One early account by a City Building Inspector testimony to City Council indicates that landlords were cooperative with the requirements made in the aftermath of substandard housing inspections (St. Petersburg Times, 1957b). Overall, however, research confirms community residents’ accounts that housing quality was very poor in the study area, that the City exercised poor enforcement in the study area, and that several families were responsible for the development of this housing. There is insufficient evidence from the research done in this study to describe the exact role of the landlords and their role in the politics of the implementation of housing and development code. However there is enough to suggest that they served as a deterrent to the effective implementation of the codes.

The condition of this available housing stock drove the development of public housing developments. In many ways, this housing was a significant improvement to the housing stock available to residents of the neighborhood. “Housing for Blacks, and maybe Whites too—they was just trash, junk, old dilapidated buildings thrown together. No heat. Black folks, Colored people as they called us then, needed a place to stay… They had done it other places too in Florida…. And with outdoor toilets then there was lots of disease” (Love, 2011, Personal Interview). In 1950, the City ordinance that led to the condemnation of half the “Negro” “shacks” led to the development of 250 rental units for 1,000 Black residents in a Bradenton Housing Authority project (Alexander, 1962).
Additionally, the adoption of the Southern Standard Code was closely related to the condemnation of decayed housing stock and the development of new public housing. “Southern Building Code—houses were not to standard. These building codes were recent. And Manatee County joined the Southern Building Code. The 44 Quarters—they were junk… So they decided the houses needed bathrooms, running water…” (Love, 2011, Personal Interview). More specifically though, the fire that claimed the life of the six children drove the City of Bradenton to seek recertification in federal housing programming, which they had voluntarily withdrawn from in 1960. The relationship between the enforcement of housing code, federal housing policy, and local political interests is very closely related. Inspectors did not have the right of entry ability on inspections, and the City claimed they had stepped up enforcement as much as the code allowed (Sarasota Journal, 1962).

While it seems that some of the key individuals responsible for the development of public housing had integrity of intent when they built the public housing projects, 1) federal policy that mandated housing segregation, and 2) Bradenton residents who did not want Black residents living in their neighborhoods are most likely responsible for the perpetuation of segregated housing. Bradenton Housing Authority board member and former Florida State Senator Ed Price discussed the location and development decisions of the Rogers Garden Project. “East Bradenton in the city limits—at that time it was called the quarters, it really wasn’t a good name. It was where the Black citizens lived… They were paper shacks, bad windows, holes in the roof, heating didn’t work, that type of thing… It was right in the area where the substandard housing was. We purchased the property, and put it right in that area… It was surrounded by the existing housing, and we
demolished the existing housing that was on the property when we purchased it” Price, 2012, Personal Interview). The project was designed and funded through a combination of local funding and standards. “It was a federal project, but we also used local money to provide different things for the housing authority itself… Primarily it was just a place for people to live. It was for people who were without funds whatsoever to live. We had playground equipment for the children, we had the housing authority board meetings, and we would hold different meetings for the tenants” Price, 2012, Personal Interview).

Local designers were used on the project, but the designers relied on federal specifications as well. “It was a combination” Price said. “I think [the local architect] came up with solar panels on the roof… The contractor was from Tampa—he served on the Housing Authority board. The federal did provide certain specifications for such building” (Price, 2012, Personal Interview).

**Urban Renewal**

The City had several forays into urban renewal between 1957 and 1975. In 1957, the City pursued urban renewal funds from the Public Housing Administration and the Home Financing Agency for an 80 unit $500,000 “Negro housing project” developed by the Bradenton Housing Authority (St. Petersburg Times, 1957e). This project had its inception in a survey of substandard housing performed by the City building inspector (all within the study area). The housing study evaluated houses east of First Street (area A) and west of First Street (area B). Area A identified 100 houses for rehabilitation and 50 for demolition. In area B, the study identified 50 houses for rehabilitation and 20 for demolition (St. Petersburg Times, 1957d). The grant application approval was delayed, however, because the Public Housing Administration approved the City’s clarification
about the creation of a planning commission (which was appointed in September 1957 after the planning commission was created), revision of the city plumbing code, information on citizen attitudes toward the project, and city attitudes toward federal slum clearance assistance (St. Petersburg Times, 1957f). Thus, in some way urban renewal had a positive impact because it served to provide an impetus for the modernization of the planning and code functions of the city.

As was the case in urban renewal cities such as Boston and New York, who experienced negative outcomes rather than the anticipated positive ones, urban renewal did not have the anticipated impact in Bradenton. Despite condemnation of a number of homes, an urban renewal plan was never approved because the City did not develop the necessary legislation or garner the appropriate public support. Just fifty-three African Americans received 100 percent long-term loans because they were displaced through the urban renewal condemnations (Alexander, 1962). Some residents appreciated the positive outcomes of the urban renewal projects: “They came in and people were able then to try and buy their homes. They may have rented it for years, and they started to try and buy. They bought the same home mostly of what they were living in” (Bacon, 2012, Personal Interview). These improvements in housing were considered positive “Because those were the best houses at the time” (Bacon, 2012, Personal Interview).

A pair of tandem City of Bradenton resolutions authorizing and facilitating urban renewal were passed in 1970. Resolution 70-11 authorized the application for funding under Title I, Section 110 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949 to be used for surveying and planning. The urban renewal area reached the Washington Park, Singletary, and East Bradenton Neighborhoods (City of Bradenton, 1970b). Resolution 70-12 established a
Housing Code Compliance Program within the Workable Program for Community Improvement already established (City of Bradenton, 1970c).

The 1975 urban renewal funding had a significant negative impact on the business vitality, a significant positive impact on infrastructure development, and a continued impact on housing infrastructure. During urban renewal, many of the unpaved streets were paved for the first time, and old substandard structures were eliminated. The three-year plan requested $622,000 a year to pave and widen 9th Avenue West (now Martin Luther King Avenue West) to a four lane street, with funding included for land acquisitions. The second year of proposed funding purchased substandard housing and buildings in the study area and supported relocation of families impacted by urban renewal. The third year of the program was dedicated to building a girl’s club and housing rehabilitation (St. Petersburg Times, 1975). Despite the plans for improvements to accompany the widening of the road, the widening took place without the improvements. “They were supposed to clean up all of the buildings and come in with new apartments. They did all of the tearing down of the buildings, but they never came in and replaced them” (Byrd, 2012).

Another resident described the changes brought about by urban renewal. “All the old houses are gone, 9th Avenue was little narrow streets, they were not paved, they had no sidewalks… On 9th Avenue, 10th Avenue, there were old houses, the streets were narrow, they didn’t pave the Black neighborhood… I was on City Council, [Mayor] Bill Evers kind of helped me with that… There were also a lot of businesses along 9th Avenue, and those kind of disappeared, they’re trying to do something about that now. There were old churches, and now there are modern ones, there was an old two story
worn down building, there was an old movie theatre and dance hall, a rooming house—
between 1st Street and 9th Street West [on Martin Luther King Avenue, in the study 
area]…. I was on City Council ’76 to ‘80, that’s when they started Section 8 and urban 
renewal, so it had to be about ‘76 – They bought those places and they paid for them. 
The buildings that they tore down, they paid for them, and the tenants that were living 
there, they paid them a substantial amount of money--$3,000 or $4,000” (Love, 2012, 
Personal Interview).

Summary

It is important to understand these race-based structural issues and the spatial and 
social issues they created in the Central CRA neighborhoods. African American 
residents did not have equal access to mobility, education, housing, or social structures, 
and were not welcome as neighbors, classmates, employees, or social cohorts. Some 
policies were implemented to be deliberately exclusionary, and it is likely that others 
were a result of racially unconscious or apathetic attitudes by community decision-
makers. While planning policy existed throughout the city, research strongly indicates 
that race played a role in the particularly casual application of planning, zoning, and 
building code policy in the Central CRA neighborhoods. This research confirms the 
expected outcome of a strong relationship between place, race, and negative social 

The overall quality of Bradenton’s neighborhoods suffered because the planning 
policies were not consistently applied in all of the neighborhoods. African Americans 
came to Bradenton very early in its history. Yet, they were not regarded in the planning 
process in the most formative years of the City. When asked about the role of Black
residents, one resident said, “Are you kidding? No ma’am! …I believe [Clarence] Love was the first Black politician, but I wasn’t down here then, so I don’t know for sure… Garry Lowe’s [the first African American police chief in the County] father was one of the first Black cops and he couldn’t arrest White people… The White people were in charge of making the decisions. Wasn’t it Governor Kirk that stood in Manatee High’s door and forbid the kids?” (Dunwoody, 2011, Personal Interview). The first year Black residents had their names on jury lists was 1941 (Evening Independent (1941) and the first Black resident ran for office in 1957 (Sarasota Herald Tribune, 1957b). When Councilman Love ran for reelection in 1979, he cites lack of Black political involvement as a key reason for his defeat. “When I was there, our folks had not started to participate in government. And that’s why I lost” (Love, 2011, Personal Conversation). Another resident recalled Black involvement as late and limited. “When Blacks really got involved mostly, when they got ready to build Rogers Project” (Bacon, 2012, Personal Conversation).

Thus, the genesis and solidification of the form and demographics of these neighborhoods lies in a strong belief in segregation, poor planning, and lax enforcement of the housing code. Once these neighborhoods were established as Black neighborhoods, they continued to grow as such because of continued policy support by White residents that restricted the mobility of Black citizens. Black residents were allowed to live in Bradenton, but their location and involvement in the life of the community was strictly limited.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

This small Sunbelt city’s social, political, and racial factors, have combined with social, political, and racial factors at the federal and state policy level to create center city decline. Literature on inner city decline indicates that federal, state and local factors all contribute to race-based spatial patterns of economic and physical decline, rather than neutral market forces. The Central CRA neighborhoods are no different. They stand out as distinctively different in quality of life and physical form compared to other neighborhoods in the city. These study area neighborhoods do not blend seamlessly with other neighborhoods in the City because they have a history of lower quality housing stock, negative economic and social indicators, absence of amenities, and poor infrastructure. Research on the Central CRA indicates that federal, state, and local planning policy in the City of Bradenton, impacted by local social, political, and racial factors, is responsible for the lack of development and decline of the Central CRA neighborhoods and their failure to be competitive in quality with others in the city. Thus, when residents choose neighborhoods, their choices are not based strictly on market forces, but on the impacts of race based policy decisions implemented over the past century. These policies impacted the mobility of the current residents, the quality of the study area neighborhoods compared to other neighborhoods in the city, and the competitiveness of the City of Bradenton as a whole.

Local policy played a different role than was expected at the outset of the study. Primarily, it was anticipated that local planning and zoning policy did not exist until the
1970s. However, zoning existed at least as early as 1925, and plats were filed in study area neighborhoods as early as 1896. The study area neighborhoods experienced deterioration and inequality because politics and racial policies prevented policy implementation and infrastructure development in the study area neighborhoods. There is no evidence that formal racialized zoning and planning policies were enacted by the City. Planning and housing policy implementation was guided by a de facto policy of segregation, and Black residents were not afforded equal participation in the social, economic, educational, and political systems of the City to impact meaningful structural changes.

The role of federal and state policy in the study area is mixed. It had the anticipated centripetal effects on suburban growth and inner city decline through federal highway policy, the development of segregated public housing in minority neighborhoods through the use of federal housing dollars for segregated public housing, and state comprehensive planning policies that facilitated new housing development in suburban greenfield communities. However, both state and federal policy forced the City to develop and enforce consistent planning, housing, and building code policies in neighborhoods (particularly the study area) where they were less inclined to do so previously. The positive impacts of these policies came too late and made it challenging for these neighborhoods to overcome the negative impacts of previous policies—particularly when faced with ongoing challenges rooted in ongoing racial prejudice and the limited efficacy of renewal programs.

The development of racially homogeneous neighborhoods in American cities has historically been a result of actions of the White racial majority. Neighborhood racial
development in Bradenton has taken the same course. The implementation of federal and local housing policy drove the development of segregated neighborhoods, as federal policy reinforced the patterns established by local stakeholders. The presence of segregation is not the problem, so much as the concurrent factors of segregation and inequality that have led to the development of neighborhoods with fewer resources than other neighborhoods in the city: Bradentons social, racial, and economic inequality is a result of discriminatory systems. The planning, zoning, and racial choices made by the City, State, and Federal policymakers are thus responsible for the development of Bradenton as a patchwork city whose neighborhoods are likely to be arranged by race and class.

**Moving Forward Towards a Seamless City**

As Dreier, et al (2004) indicates, cities with faltering centers underperform as a metropolitan whole, and communities with high income disparities were more likely to have lower employment growth. Bradenton has been a patchwork city because of the layers of policy impacting the center city neighborhoods. To become a seamless city operating at full capacity, Bradenton must attend to the interest of all its citizens. Fortunately, however, the governmental structure of the study area is ideal for facilitating the type of multi-level, comprehensive, targeted infrastructure reinvestment the neighborhoods need to overcome the decline brought about by 100 years of infrastructure investment disparities. As a community redevelopment area (CRA), these neighborhoods have the benefit of 30 years of dedicated funding by ad valorem tax revenue provided through tax increment financing (TIF). This funding increases in value from a fixed base year (City of Bradenton, 2000; City of Bradenton, 2001). The most skillful CRAs
leverage TIF revenue to bring state, local, and private funding to their redevelopment districts, as municipalities have historically done very effectively in their non-poverty neighborhoods.

This is relevant for cities throughout the Sunbelt who experience economic decline and search for answers to transform from patchwork to seamless cities. The reasons for patchwork communities often lie in their history, just as it does in the history of race, planning, and politics in Bradenton. The path to a seamless city lies in an inclusive, comprehensive agenda for development. St. Petersburg Mayor Rick Baker articulated this philosophy when he described his commitment for revitalizing a center city neighborhood in St. Petersburg, FL.

“In order for a city to reach its full potential, the whole community must be included in the progress. When a portion of the city is left behind, resentment follows, and the forward movement cannot be sustained. This is especially true of the most economically depressed portions of the city, areas that often have a high percentage of minority residents. A city can never declare success if children in some of its neighborhoods are growing up without home, in urban decay and unsafe streets” (Baker, 2011, p. 98).

To become a seamless City, Bradenton will have to renew its infrastructure and maximize the human capital of the center city neighborhoods. As a high density neighborhood with connectivity to government and employment centers, the low incomes of the study area belie a skill gap. The Central CRA has been recognized for effectively leveraging its TIF revenue stream to expand its capacity to implement a variety of economic development programming. A 5-year, $200,000 commitment to the CareerEdge Workforce Funders Collaborative Manatee Sarasota attracted $4 million to workforce trainings in high skilled, high growth jobs with potential for career laddering. The Florida Redevelopment Association awarded the Central CRA its 2011 President’s
Award for the project, officially started in 2010, because its public private partnership and leveraging model “exemplifies the new creative era of redevelopment initiatives in Florida” (Florida Redevelopment Association, 2011). The Central CRA has provided seed funding for Suncoast Community Capital, a 501c3 non-profit founded in 2009 that focuses on small business development and provides a conduit for federal and foundation funding on capital projects. The seed funding provided by the CCRA attracted national foundation dollars and federal grants to fund the organization’s entrepreneurship programing. Public private partnerships such as these maximize the impact of the agency TIF revenue, and implement strategies to mitigate gentrification. Primarily, these types of partnerships are important because they provide residents access to economic development programming that develops their human capital and economic assets, which are two important elements in the development of a seamless city. Both economic and human capital asset building programming builds the foundation for the sustainable development of a seamless city by providing residents of distressed neighborhoods with the increased income generating capacity needed to build financially sustainable neighborhood infrastructure.

The CCRA has employed the same partnership and leveraging strategy with capital projects. Completed in 2011, its $6 million, 25-acre Norma Lloyd Park project was funded through $2.7 million in TIF revenue as well as state, County, City, and private funding. This funding brought the community new amenities such as new football bleachers and a field house / concession stand, redesigned baseball fields, a multi-purpose soccer field, basketball courts, 2 playgrounds, a bridge and walking trail, and a newly constructed community center. The CCRA leveraged its land investment
and projected project TIF revenue commitment to bring an urban format grocery store retail plaza to its under-retailed neighborhoods. The CCRA has used its partnership with Suncoast Community Capital to apply for federal financing dollars to fill the equity gap that exists because the project cannot attract the rents it would in a suburban market, despite the high demand for fresh food in the neighborhood.

If the CCRA continues to employ these comprehensive partnership-based, economic development and infrastructure enhancement strategies to the study area, the accumulated negative impacts of federal, state, and local policy can be overcome to maximize the competitive advantage of these neighborhoods. Small business development and workforce training are a key component of this strategy, because the 4,506 residents of the study area are poised to increase their productive economic capacity. The successful engagement of public and private partners can jump start the market in these neighborhoods and facilitate the comprehensive changes to the study area infrastructure, which have contributed to center city decline and a patchwork city in Bradenton, FL
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